DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 328 EA 010 513

AUTHOR	Eastabrook, Glenn; Fullan, Michael
TITLE	School and Community: Principals and Community Schools in Ontario.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Dept. of Education, Toronto.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	384p.; Appendix B may not reproduce clearly
AVAILABLE FROM	Ontario Government Bookstore, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M7A 1L2 ($4.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$20.75 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Role; Community Characteristics; Community Involvement; *Community Schools; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Parent Participation; *Principals; *School Community Relationship; *School Surveys; Statistical Data; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*Ontario

ABSTRACT

This report provides a description and analysis of various aspects of the relationship between schools and communities in Ontario, Canada. A survey of 1,023 Ontario elementary and secondary school principals yielded data that provided a general description of the overall role of the principal and that indicated the nature of community involvement and the principal's role in the initiation and maintenance of school-community activities. Part 1 examines principals' attitudes and behaviors in relation to the school and the community, including their perceptions of their roles in community involvement and their preparation for dealing with the community. Part 2 summarizes data on Ontario community schools, including school characteristics, history, organization, staffing, and school-community activities. Part 3 reviews the community school movement and notes implications for school leadership. (Author/DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED153328

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY: PRINCIPALS AND COMMUNITY SCHOOLS IN ONTARIO

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ontario Ministry
of Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Investigators:
GLENN EASTABROOK
MICHAEL FULLAN

EA 010 513

This research project was funded under contract by the Ministry of Education, Ontario

© The Minister of Education, Ontario, 1978
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario

Printed by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Originally submitted to the Ministry of Education, Ontario, as part of contractual research under the titles Community Schools Survey, Spring, 1975, and Survey of Ontario School Principals : Their Role in Relation to School and Community, April, 1977.

Additional copies may be ordered from:
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Publications Sales
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

or from:

The Ontario Government Bookstore
880 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1L2

Record Number ON00637

1 2 3 4 5 XX 18 08 47 87

Abstract

This report provides a description and analysis of various aspects of the relationship between schools and communities in Ontario in a series of studies financed by the Ontario Ministry of Education (under Contract 7). It is divided into three parts. Parts I and II are based on two independent but related research studies -- one on the role of school principals and the other directly on a sample of community schools. Part III addresses the implications of both studies.

Part I examines the role of the school principal with specific references to community-school exchanges. It focusses on the role of Ontario school principals today. Specifically, we look at the principals' attitudes and behaviours in relation to the school and the surrounding community.

Data were collected in the Spring of 1976 through a province-wide survey of representative samples of school principals. In total, 1023 principals were selected by means of a stratified random sampling procedure. To ensure statistically adequate representation, we used the following subgroupings: principals working in elementary and secondary Public School Boards and R.C. Separate and Private School Boards, English and French language schools, and male and female principals. There were 825 (80.6%) questionnaires returned. Through the questionnaires, we examined the principals' perceptions of their overall role in the school and of the relative importance of different types of activities, including community-related ones, in this overall role. We also asked principals to indicate the nature and extent of current community-involving activities at their schools and examined, in detail, the principal's role in the initiation and maintenance of these activities.

Data from the survey were analysed to provide a general description of the overall role of the principal and also to examine the principal's role in different types of school settings - Public vs. Roman Catholic Separate/Private Roman Catholic Boards; Elementary vs. Secondary levels; Urban vs. Rural school locations; and French-language vs. English-language schools. We also compared female principal and male principal perceptions of the principal role.

4

We found that in all types of schools, there was some degree of community involvement. Nearly all schools provided opportunities for community/ parental input. These ranged from a regularly scheduled meeting of a formally organized group, to annual open informational meetings, to individual meetings of school personnel with parents. Most schools used community resources as a part of the learning experience (e.g. field trips). However, community involvement is by no means uniform.

We have found relatively few differences which can be attributed solely to school location (i.e. rural vs. urban). There was a slight tendency for principals in certain types of rural schools to be somewhat more favourable to community involvement than those in urban schools. There were some differences between schools with female principals and those with male principals; the latter had a somewhat greater level of school-community exchange.

What is apparent is that the major factors affecting the relationships between the community and the school are complex. From the principal's viewpoint, the form and degree of the community-school relationship is determined by the amount of time and energy which he/she can devote to community-related activities, the amount of Ministry/Board support which can be allocated for community-school activities, and community apathy. At the same time they see their role being extended in other areas, particularly in the areas of curriculum development, staff support, and student service.

Contents

Abstract/iii

List of Tables/viii

Acknowledgments/xvi

PART I PRINCIPALS AND THE COMMUNITY/1

1 Introduction/3

2 Review of the Literature/7

- Community-School Exchanges/7
- The School Principal/10
- The Community School Principal/12
- Implications of the Review/13

3 Methodology/14

- Questionnaire Design/14
- Sampling Procedures/15
- Field Relations/18
- Data Analysis/21

4 Basic Findings for the Five Types of Schools/23

- Introduction/23

Settings of Ontario Schools and Characteristics of Their Principals

- (a) School and Community Characteristics/25
- (b) Principal's Characteristics/33
- (c) Summary of Findings Presented in Section 1/37

The Nature and Extent of Community-Related Activities in Ontario Schools

- (a) Communication with Parents/39
- (b) Community-oriented Curriculum/44
- (c) Community Use of Facilities/47
- (d) School-Community Organizations/56
- (e) Community Participation in Decision-Making/63
- (f) Summary of Findings Presented in Section 2/69

The Role of the Principal in Ontario Schools/76

- (a) Principals' Time-Allocation for Various Tasks - Actual and Ideal/76
- (b) Who Could Assist With Aspects of the Principal's Job?/82
- (c) Constraining Factors on the Principalship/86
- (d) Greatest Problems of Principalship/88
- (e) What Role Does the Principal Play in Relation to Parents and Community?/99
- (f) How Do Principals Feel About Being Involved in Community-School Relations?/108
- (g) Principals' Perceptions of Supportive Factors For and Of Barriers to Community Involvement in School/114
- (h) Principals' Preparation For Dealing with Community Involvement/124
- (i) Summary of Findings Presented in Section 3/132

5 Urban-Rural Differences in Findings/145

- Introduction/145
- Urban-Rural Differences in Community-Related Activities in Schools/148
- Urban-Rural Differences in Principals' Attitude Towards and Participation in Community-Related Activities/155
- Summary/161

6 Findings for Male versus Female Principals/163

- Introduction/163
- Sampling for Female Addendum/164

Findings According to Sex of Principal

- Principals' Background Characteristics/167
- Male vs. Female Principal Perceptions and Performance Regarding the Principal's Role/170
- Male vs. Female Principals' Professional Relationships/183
- Community-Involving Activities in Schools With Male vs. Female Principals/193
- Male and Female Principals' Involvement In and Attitude Towards Community-Related Activities at School/197
- Summary of Findings/204

7 Summary of Findings/206

- Elements of School-Community Relationships/206
- The Principal's Role in the School as a Whole/210
- The Principal's Role in Relation to Community/212

PART II COMMUNITY SCHOOLS/217

8 Introduction to Part II/219

9 Methodology for Part II/224

10 Survey Findings/230

School Characteristics/230

History/232

Community-School Activities/239

- Parent and Community Volunteers/239
- Advisory Committees/244
- Children's Recreational Programs/245
- Adult Programs/248
- School Areas Open to the Community/250
- Special Services/251
- Community Work/252
- Neighbourhood Improvement Programs/253

Organization/255

Staffing/265

Funding for Community Schools/270

Issues/274

Summary of Findings/282

11 Case Studies of Community Schools/286

- Introduction/286
- Suburban Elementary School/287
- Rural Elementary School/296
- Urban Secondary School/302

PART III IMPLICATIONS OF THE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY/309

Implications of the School and Community/311

- Leadership and Leadership Support/318
- Board Guidelines/320
- Goals/321
- Formalization/322
- Staff Support/323
- Communication/324
- Participants/325
- Funding/326
- Community Control/328
- The Community and the School/328

APPENDICES/332

A Principals's Questionnaire/333
B Duties of the Principal/361

BIBLIOGRAPHY/363

List of Tables

PART I

1 School Size for 5 Types of Schools/26

2 Number of Vice-Principals in 5 Types of Schools/26

3 Grade Levels Served by 5 Types of Schools/26

4 Population of Town for 5 Types of Schools/28

5 Community Type for 5 Types of Schools/28

6 Occupation of Family Head of Students in 5 Types of Schools/31

7 Ethnic Types Forming Majority Groups (over 50%) in 5 Types of Schools/31

8 Ethnic Types Forming Minority Groups (10% to 50%) in 5 Types of Schools/32

9 Age of Principals in 5 Types of Schools/34

10 Sex of Principals in 5 Types of Schools/34

11 Education of Principals in 5 Types of Schools/34

12 Number of Years as Vice-Principal by Principals of 5 Types of Schools/36

13 Years as Principal for 5 Types of Schools/36

14 Years as Principal at Present School for 5 Types of Schools/36

15 Number of Newsletters Sent Home in School Year 1975-76 in 5 Types of Schools/41

16 Principal's Weekly Talks with Parents in 5 Types of Schools/41

17 Organized Parent Visits per Year in 5 Types of Schools/41

18 Yearly Plays, Concerts or Other Student Performances in 5 Types of Schools/43

19 Use of Community Media by 5 Types of Schools/43

20 Community Issues in Curriculum of 5 Types of Schools/43

21 Field Trips in 5 Types of Schools/45

22 Courses with Out-of-School Components in Local Community in 5 Types of Schools/45

23 Regular Volunteers/48

24 Occasional Volunteers/48

25 Frequency of Use of Visiting Speakers in 5 Types of Schools/48

26 After Hours Recreational and/or Educational Activities for Children/Teens and/or Adults in 5 Types of Schools/49

27 Types of After-Hours Activities for Children/Teenagers/51

28 Types of Recreational/Educational Activities for Adults/51

29 Who is Mainly Responsible for Youth Activities Offered After Hours in 5 Types of Schools/54

30 Who is Mainly Responsible for Adult Activities Offered in 5 Types of Schools/54

31 Special Services Offered at 5 Types of Schools/57

32 Recent Involvement in Neighbourhood Improvement Projects in 5 Types of Schools/57

33 School Level Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools/59

34 Effectiveness of School Level Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools/59

35 School Representation on Board/Family of Schools Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools/62

36 Parent/Community Participation ("A Great Deal" or "Somewhat") in Kinds of Decisions in 5 Types of Schools/62

37 Principals' Comments About Community Involvement Leading to Community Control in 5 Types of Schools/65

38 Principals' Estimates of Level of Community Interest in 5 Types of Schools/70

39 Principals Spending "A Great Deal" or "Quite A Bit" of Time on Each of 8 Types of Activities in 5 Types of Schools/77

40 Principals Who Would Like, Ideally, to Spend "A Great Deal" or "Quite A Bit" of Time on Each of 8 Types of Activities in 5 Types of Schools/80

41 Principals' Suggestions For Who Might Assume Less Desired Parts of Their Roles in 5 Types of Schools/83

42 Factors Which Principals Find Contraining ("A Great Deal" or "Somewhat") In Carrying Out Their Roles in 5 Types of Schools/87

43 Principals' Judgments About "The Greatest Problem Facing the Principalship Today" in 5 Types of Schools/89

44 Principals' Role in Parent Volunteer Program, in 5 Types of Schools/100

45 Principals' Role in Aspects of School Program, Where Students Work in the Community in 5 Types of Schools/100

46 Principals' Involvement in School Level Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools/102

47 Principals' Involvement in General Level Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools/102

48 Principals' Involvement in Youth and/or Adult Activities in 5 Types of Schools/105

49 Extra Demands on Principal Resulting From Community Use of School Facilities in 5 Types of Schools/105

50 Who Takes the Greatest Responsibility for Organizing and/or Supervising Community-Related Activities in 5 Types of Schools/107

51 Principals' Preferences Regarding Spending More, the Same, or Less Time with Parent/Community Activities Than They Currently Do in 5 Types of Schools/109

52 Principals' Level of Satisfaction with Parent Communication in 5 Types of Schools/111

53 Principals' Opinions About Parent Initiative in Approaching School Re School Matters in 5 Types of Schools/111

54 Principals' Attitude About Community Use of School Facilities in 5 Types of Schools/113

55 Principals' Perceptions of What Groups Favour ("Very Much" or "Somewhat") Increased Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools/115

56 Principals' Perceptions of Support Needs for Increased Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools/117

57 Principals' Perceptions of Major Barriers to the Development of Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools/121

58 Skills or Resources Which Principals Feel They Personally Need to Acquire in Order to Deal More Successfully with Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools/125

59 Principals' Choice for Who Should Help to Develop Their Skills Needed for Greater Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools/128

60 Community-Related Conferences Attended in Past 2 Years by Principals in 5 Types of Schools/130

61 Degree to Which Above Conferences Were Found to be Worthwhile/130

62 Regular Use of Parent Volunteers in Public Elementary Schools in Urban and Rural Settings/150

63 Frequency of Visiting Speakers in Urban vs. Rural Public Secondary Schools Reporting Such Visits/150

64 Frequency of Field Trips to Local Community in Urban vs. Rural Schools of 3 Types/150

65 Activities for Children or Youth in Public Elementary Schools in Urban vs. Rural Communities/152

66 Library Open to Public in Public Secondary Schools in Urban vs. Rural Settings/152

67 Special Services Offered to Public in Public Elementary Schools in 3 Types of Urban Settings/154

68 Neighbourhood Improvement Projects in 2 Types of Schools Located in 3 Types of Urban Settings/154

69 Principal's Opinion Regarding Parent Involvement in Decisions Affecting School Curriculum in 3 Types of Schools in Urban and Rural Settings/156

70 Principal's Opinion Regarding Parent Involvement in Decisions Affecting School Philosophy in Public Elementary Schools in Urban and Rural Settings/157

71 Principal's Opinion Regarding Parent Initiative in Approaching School in Public Elementary Schools in 3 Types of Urban Settings/157

72 Extra Demands Made on Principal by Community Use of Facilities of Public Elementary Schools in 3 Types of Urban Settings/159

73 Degree to Which Principals in Public Elementary Schools in 3 Types of Urban Settings Favour Community Use of Their School's Facilities/159

74 Degree to Which Principals in Public Elementary Schools in Urban and Rural Settings Favour Community Use of Their School's Facilities/160

75 Degree to Which Principals in 2 Types of Elementary Schools in Urban and Rural Settings Favour Increased Community Involvement at Their Schools/160

76 Ages of Male and Female Principals in 4 Types of Schools/169

77 Education of Male and Female Principals in 5 types of Schools/169

78 Vice-Principal Experience of Male and Female Principals in 2 Types of Elementary Schools/170

79 Years of Experience of Male and Female Principals in 4 Types of Schools/171

80 Years Spent at Current Schools by Male and Female Principals in 4 Types of Schools/171

81 Time Spent on Curriculum-Related Tasks by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools/173

82 Time Spent on Tasks Related to Support Staff by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools/173

83 Time Spent on Classroom Teaching by Male and Female Principals in 2 Types of Elementary Schools/174

84 Time Spent on Tasks Related to Teaching Staff by Male and Female Principals in R.C./Pr. Schools/174

85 Preference About Time Spent on Administrative Tasks by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools/175

86 Preference About Time Spent on Curriculum Related Tasks by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools/175

87 Preference About Time Spent on Teaching-Staff [illegible]ated Tasks by Male and Female Principals of Secon[illegible] Schools/176

88 Preference About Time Spent on Classroom Te[illegible]g by Male and Female Principals in 3 Types of Sc[illegible]/176

89 Degree to Which Male and Female Principals i[illegible] Secondary Schools See Board Administration as Source of Constraint/179

90 Degree to Which Male and Female Principals in 2 Types of Schools See Board Trustees as Sources of Constraint/179

91 Degree to Which Male and Female Principals in 3 Types of Schools See Students as Sources of Constraint/180

92 Degree to Which Male and Female Principals in Secondary Schools & R.C./Pr. Schools Find Time a Source of Constraint/180

93 Degree to Which Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools Find Budget to be a Source of Constraint/181

94 Degree to Which Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools Find "Formal Administrative Procedures" to be a Source of Constraint/181

95 Degree to Which Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools Find Support Staff Unions to be a Source of Constraint/182

96 Degree to Which Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools Find the Ministry of Education to be a Source of Constraint/182

97 Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Teaching Staff in 5 Types of Schools/186

98 Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Support Staff in 5 Types of Schools/186

99 Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Students in 5 Types of Schools/187

100 Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Parents and Community in 5 Types of Schools/187

101 Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Board Administration in 5 Types of Schools/188

102 Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Fellow Principals in 5 Types of Schools/188

103 Existence of Programs Involving Students Going Out Into the Community in 3 Types of Schools with Male and Female Principals/195

104 After-Hours Activities for Children/Youth in 4 Types of Schools With Male and Female Principals/195

105 Sharing by Parents/Community in Decisions Affecting Curriculum in Secondary Schools & R.C./Pr. Schools With Male and Female Principals/196

106 Sharing by Parents/Community in Decisions Affecting Rules and Regulations in Secondary Schools & R.C./Pr. Schools With Male and Female Principals/196

107 Sharing by Parents/Community in Decisions Affecting School Philosophy in 2 Types of Schools With Male and Female Principals/198

108 Male and Female Principals' Preferences Regarding Parent Visits to 5 Types of Schools/198

109 Male and Female Principals' Preferences Regarding Parent Initiative in Approaching Public Elementary Schools/198

110 Male and Female Principals' Role in School-Level Community Committees in 2 Types of Elementary Schools/200

111 Male and Female Principals' Role in General Level Community Committees for 2 Types of Schools/200

112 Active Involvement (Organizing/Coordinating) of After-Hours Programs for Children/Adults by Male and Female Principals in 2 Types of Schools/201

113 Male and Female Principals Active as Instructors or Supervisors in After-Hours Programs for Children/Adults in 3 Types of Elementary Schools/202

114 Male and Female Principals Active as Resource Persons for After-Hours Activities for Children/Adults in 3 Types of Schools/202

115 Extra Demands Made on Male and Female Principals by Community Use of School Facilities in 4 Types of Schools/203

116 Male and Female Principals' Attitude to Community Use of School Facilities in 5 Types of Schools/203

PART II

117 Position of Person Completing Questionnaire/229

118 School Size/231

119 School Type/232

120 Type of Community Served by School/232

121 Year of Commencement of Community School Activities/233

122 Major Impetus for Introduction of Notion of Community School/233

123 Persons Playing Major Role in Setting Up of Community School/235

124 Visits to Other Community Schools/235

125 Initial Goals and Objectives/238

126 Changes in Goals Over Time/238

127 Assessment of Effectiveness in Meeting Goals/239

128 Use of Volunteer Assistance/241

129 Functions of "Occassional" and "Other" Volunteers/241

130 School Type by Types of Programs/242

131 Community Type by Types of Programs/242

132 Length of Existence of Community School by Types of Programs/243

133 Membership of Advisory Committees/246

134 Recreational Activities for Youth/247

135 Recreational Activities for Adults/249

136 Open Areas in the School/251

137 Special Services/252

138 Community Work/253-4

139 Neighbourhood Improvement Projects/255-6
140 Extensiveness of School's Involvement/256
141 Needs Assessment/258
142 Informing the Community/259
143 Coordinating Core Group/262
144 School Type and Community Type by Existence of Community School Association/262
145 Span of Existence of Core Group/262
146 Constitution/263
147 Frequency of Meetings/263
148 Number of Members/263
149 Types of Members/263
150 Who are the Other Members?/265
151 School Staff Involvement/267
152 Type of Involvement/268
153a Designation of Responsibility for Community Activities to One Person/268
153b Title of Person/268
153c Persons Involved in Activities at More Than One Community School/268
153d Responsibilities of Person/269
154 Children's Program Instructors/269
155 Adults' Program Instructors/270
156 Funding/272
157 School Type by Sources of Funding/273
158 Community Type by Sources of Funding/273
159 Effect of Community Use on Vandalism/274
160 Factors Contributing to Success of Community Schools/278
161 Barriers to Success of Community Schools/278
162 Direction of Community Schools/282

FIGURES

1 Summary of Sampling Procedures and Response Rates/20
2 Summary of Sampling Procedures for Male and Female Principles/166
3 Summary of Sampling Procedures (Part II)/226

Acknowledgments

This study has been funded through an Ontario Ministry of Education contract. We would like to thank the Ministry supervisory officials who have helped in developing the scope and design of the study, and who have provided consultative and supervisory services by making suggestions at all stages for improving the project.

We also wish to thank the Directors of the Provincial School Boards for their support and co-operation.

We are particularly grateful to each of the school principals and community schools personnel who participated in the study for their co-operation in providing us with information.

Finally, we would like to thank Carolyn Hider and Joan May for their contribution in assisting in the preparation of the draft of the report.

Part I Principals and the Community

18

1 Introduction

This study is divided into three main parts. Parts I and II are based on two independent but related research studies on the theme of school and community. Part I is a study of Ontario school principals involving representative samples of approximately 20% of the elementary school principals in the public and separate school systems, and higher percentages from secondary schools and French language schools. The aims of this part of the study were (1) to discover how principals see their role in relation to school and community, and (2) to identify the changing nature of the principal's role, and factors which might affect performance in relation to this role.

Part III is based on the direct survey of 271 community schools and three brief case studies in which we examined the nature and characteristics of community schools, the history and origins of programs, the leadership, organization, staffing, and funding -- all of these in the context of identifying factors which facilitated and inhibited the development of community school programs.

The research contained in Part I was carried out in 1976-77, and the study reported in Part II was conducted in 1974-75. We have presented the latter (1976-77) study first because it presents a more general and representative picture of the Ontario situation, and provides a valuable context for Part II.

Part III, Implications of the School and Community, consists of an overview of the main policy and research implications of the study as a whole, including recommendations.

Focus of the Study

In previous work (see Part II) we examined how schools attempted to bring together the resources and interests of the neighbouring community with those of the school. A number of implications emerged from these research findings. Almost without exception, we found that school representatives (principal, vice-principal, community-school officer) advocated closer community-school exchanges. Yet on the basis of the wide range of activities and the high degree of diversity in responses, the suggestions are: (1) that experimentation and development are still very much a characteristic of community involvement in schools, and (2) there is a high level of autonomy among Boards and within schools regarding the form and nature of the community school. The major sources of support seemed to be individual optimism and energy. Our study did not in general provide evidence of long-range planning and organization. There was, however, widespread agreement that the key factor in facilitating any effective community-school program was the leadership in the school. It became apparent that the school principal was of primary importance in the initiation and development of community-school exchanges and programs. As well, it became apparent that if the exchange was to become regularized, the principal would be one of the central factors. For these reasons we begin to develop a study which would examine the principal's role. A particular emphasis was placed on the principal's role as it related to the community. A related emphasis was the need to find out the nature and extent of the provisions for community-related activities in the school. We assumed that the type of community (e.g. rural, urban, suburban) in which the school was located might affect the principal's role. We also assumed that the type and level of the school would affect the principal's role. The sex of the principal was a further factor which we felt could affect the role. Accordingly, sampling was done so as to ensure a statistically adequate number of principals from Roman Catholic and public schools, from elementary and secondary level schools, from French language and English language schools, and within these school types, of female and male principals.[2]

---

[2] The details of sampling are given in Chapter 3, Methodology, page 14.

Organization of the Report

This part of the report is divided into seven chapters. The second chapter reviews the literature relevant to community schools and to the principal's role and examines studies of leadership roles in education, particularly in the context of community schools and community-related activities. Chapter 3 describes the methods of research: the design and execution of the study and the analysis of the data. We also discuss practical aspects of such a study (e.g., field relations, sampling procedures). The next three chapters contain a comprehensive description of the questionnaire data: Chapter 4 presents the findings broken down to show profiles of the major types of schools in Ontario. Our research called for a description of the data in terms of three factors regarding type of school:

1) Public vs. Roman Catholic Administrative systems,[3]
2) Elementary vs. secondary levels of schooling,
3) English language vs. French language schools.

Accordingly, we have five types of schools: at the elementary level, public elementary,[4] Separate English language and Separate French language; at the secondary level, public secondary and Roman Catholic Separate/Private. We were also asked to determine if there were differences in the data in terms of the school's setting or location, i.e. rural vs. urban. These data are presented in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 presents data which compare male vs. female perceptions of the principal role. In addition to the brief summary which follows the detailed description of each section of the data, we have provided, in Chapter 7, an overall summary of the findings of the study.

---

3. In Ontario, there are two school systems supported directly by public tax monies. One, operated by public school boards, provides an educational program for Kindergarten through Grade 13. In our report, we use the term public schools or public school system to designate schools under these boards.

(cont.)

(footnote cont.)

3. The other system, operated by Roman Catholic Separate Boards of Education, provides for Roman Catholics an educational program for Kindergarten through Grade 10, i.e., elementary school and the first two years of the secondary school program. Where the Roman Catholic members of a community wish to continue the educational program to the end of Grade 13, they must form a Private School Board. In such cases, two boards administer the secondary school program: a Roman Catholic Separate Board of Education (Grades 9-10) and a Private School Board (Grades 11-13). When referring to these schools, we use the form "R.C./Pr. schools" (9-13). We use the expression "Separate/Private systems" when we refer to the combination of K-8 (elementary level) schools of Roman Catholic Separate Boards with the 9-13 (secondary level) schools of R.C./Pr. Boards.

4. Because of the very few French language schools in the public school system, we have examined only the English language schools in the public system.

2 Review of the Literature

This chapter, which presents our summary of the literature relevant to the topic, is divided into four parts. The first addresses the recent but growing body of literature concerning community-school exchanges. The following headings are typical: community-schools, community education, community involvement, community use of schools. The second, a more established and more extensive body of literature, focusses on the school principalship. This body of literature has examined the principalship in the conventional or traditional day-school setting. The third part looks at the recent literature which examines the new phenomenon, the community-school principal. The chapter concludes with an assessment of the areas of study currently missing in the bodies of literature reviewed. Before proceeding to the specific studies, several overall observations should be made. We examined each study from three perspectives: What were the theoretical underpinnings of the study (what model or theory was the study based on)? What were the empirical underpinnings (what was the data base or evidence to support/reject the model)? To what extent was the study generalizable (were the "findings" relevant to other situations - school or community)? Finally, we would like to emphasize that we have attempted to characterize the major types of literature and problems therein, rather than report fully on the rapidly expanding community-schools literature.

Community-School Exchanges

In general, the writings and studies of community-school exchanges have tended to be atheoretical. That is, they are not based on specific theories or models, but are instead statements or descriptions of facts (or "desirable" happenings) which have occurred because of value positions which may or may not be clearly stated. For example, one finds that in the Pendell* series on community education, there are examples of community-

---

* Boles (1973), Decker (1972), Hickey et al (1969), Minzey, LeTarte (1972), Totten (1969), Seay et al (1974).

23

school exchanges and interaction; ways of implementing these examples are also given. While the series is useful in that these books offer techniques and specific activities which a school might use to extend its services to a broader community (and presumably meet certain needs in that community), they do not provide us with models which specify the assumptions or conditions which must exist in the schools and in the broader community before any one form of community-school exchange can occur.

Decker and Seay et al. have presented a historical account of the "facts" which occurred in various parts of the U.S. which they say have led first to community-schools and then to community education. Basically the sequence of events or facts leading to community-schools as they perceived it was as follows: teachers and education in general had developed the skills and enthusiasm and commitment to bringing about the post-World War I idealism. In the emergency of the 1929-1932 economic crisis, people turned to the school for leadership not just in child-rearing and in general, but to resolve broader community problems. In essence, the school came to be seen as a (the?) community problem-solver. Community education on the other hand seems to require a process or a series of events wherein the community becomes "self actualized" to use Minzey's and Le Tarte's phrase; that is, a situation where "a community is capable of the initiative and sustained action necessary for attacking and solving its own problems and when it is moving in the direction of the fulfillment of individual needs and community potential" (Minzey and Le Tarte, p. 33).

In terms of literature describing the United States situation, a fundamental component of the successful community-school and community education process, it seems, is a high level of credibility of the school and school staff in the eyes of the members of the community. A second component seems to be a high degree of community homogeneity or agreement in terms of desired goals and the means to reach those goals. A third component is a close fit between the local community and the national interests and needs.

It appears that the community school has been seen, at least by the writers cited above, as the vehicle central to realizing a specific ideology and that community education was seen as a process which could lead to the effective operation of that ideology. A great proportion of the literature surveyed seems to accept or not to question the issue of "why" and to advocate community schools/education prescribing explicit procedures to be followed. (In addition to Minzey and Le Tarte (1972), Seay (Chapters IV through XVI, 1974) the reader is referred to Kindred et al. (1976)).*

In Canada as yet there are no major treatises on community-schools or community education. There are a growing number of philosophical statements about the merits of and need for the community school (although its form tends not to be specified except by implication (e.g. Chapman, 1972; Smilanich, 1973; Stevens, 1974, New Dimensions Vol. 6 No. 8 (1972); Alla[illegible], 1973; Rose, 1973). Frequently the basis for these statements is a description of an activity or activities regarding a community-school exchange, e.g. Rose, 1973; Pomfret, 1972; Shuttleworth, 1971; Filson, 1976; Cressy, 1977. A more comprehensive description and analysis of public involvement in educational decision-making can be found in Lind (1974), Martell (1974) and Stamp (1975). An unfortunate fact, in Ontario at least, is that there seems to be no central clearing house either with the Ministry or at the university level for community-schools education studies, reports, or statements. We have found that a number of Boards are conducting surveys or case studies of community-related activities but that these reports or studies seem not to go beyond the local level. The report closest to a Province-wide survey of community-school exchanges is that done by Clifford and others, 1976. While this report does present a picture of "what is happening," the analysis is such that we do not know cause and effect relationships (e.g. of various forms and practices of community-school committees). A second account of activities throughout Ontario is Gayfer's Open Doors (1977) where case studies of specific community-schools are presented; the report concludes with a synthesis of approaches regarding the carrying out of forms of community-school exchanges.

---

* There are several exceptions. Notable are the analyses addressing the accountability issue (schools should be accountable to their public(s)), e.g. Fein (1971) and Fantini (1976) Levin ed. (1970).

Like its U.S. counterparts, Gayfer's Open Doors offers useful descriptions but does not provide analysis of the case studies. The case studies do not include details of the conditions (e.g. community attitudes, school personnel attitudes, Board support) under which the various programs operate. Currently, the Ministry of Education has a community-school Development Grant plan which funds projects which are intended to facilitate closer community-school relationships. The reports of these projects will contribute to the growing data bank on community-school exchanges, but will not necessarily contribute to a research analysis of why things are happening as they are.

At the present time there seems to be three separate characteristics of community-schools or community education: (1) community member involvement in decision-making around the school program, (2) community resources being used in school programs (e.g. parent volunteers, field trips), (3) community use of school facilities. It seems to be assumed that (2) and (3) will lead to (1), and that (1) can lead to (2) and (3). That is, given a situation where community resources are used by the schools or where members are using school resources, it is assumed that eventually the school and community members will have to negotiate the use of resources. It is also assumed that community members, through their involvement in school decision-making, become aware of what they can contribute to the school and what the school can offer them.

From our point of view it is because of this tendency to write specific descriptions of arrays of activities or to prescribe specific directions, each of which may require quite different sets of preconditions (including human and material resources and political and economic climates) that there has been so much uncertainty about the value of community schools or community education.

The School Principal

In general, we have found the literature in this area to be more theoretical in focus than the community-schools studies. As well, we found each study to be relatively specific in that only one aspect or set of aspects of the principalship tend to be examined at once. One source which we found useful was Boles and Davenport (1975), which presents not only the theoretical underpinnings and assumptions of specified leadership models, but also attempts to present these models in a social setting. That is, it shows the relationship(s) of a given model with the relevant factors at play in the school itself, in the school system, and in the broader community. In Specifically, the authors note the relationships between the culture, the social institutions in that culture, the agencies comprising the institution, the positions existing in the agencies and the subsequent roles within those positions, and how these relationships are affected by social values. Thus we can begin to identify the conditions which must exist before certain leadership models can be effective and, knowing these conditions and the details of the model, we can predict certain outcomes. The Boles and Davenport source, however, is somewhat unique in that it presents a primarily theoretical perspective and overview of the principalship although it is not directly linked to empirical data or immediate physical experience.

The majority of the research studying the principal's role which we examined focused on one aspect of the role. Examples are leadership (Halpin, 1959; Likert, 1967), principal as change agent (Gross et al, 1971), in-school expectation of the principal (Horowitz et al, 1969; Canadian Educators Association, 1971; and Fosbett, 1967), performance of tasks in the school (Scott, 1965; and Goldhammer et al, 1970). The general conclusion arrived at after examining surveys such as these is that the role of the principal is ambiguous (Goldhammer and Becker hold a similar position, Goldhammer & Becker, 1970, p. 11). Certainly there are divergent expectations both from fellow workers (superintendents, teachers) and from principals themselves.

A second type of report which we studied was more prescriptive. That is, these studies advocate specific activities for the principal to do (e.g., Jacobson et al, 1973) or a role set which the principal should adopt (e.g., Watts, 1976). While these are useful in that they may suggest new directions, it seems to us they tend to serve as sources of more activities for they fail to take into account the total role of the principal and the setting of that role. They ignore the question, if new activities are taken on by the principal, of the implications for the principal's role both in terms of the performance of current activities and of new activities.

The Community School Principal

This is an area which has just opened up within the past decade. Our survey suggests that the basic weakness in the area stems from the lack of conceptually consistent theoretic models and empirical research. One exception to this criticism is the work of Wilson and Smith (1974), where they present their findings of a content analysis of periodicals and books regarding the public school principal's function in community-school relations. However, the picture of the principal's role they present is based on secondary sources, which in turn are based on personal conjecture, case studies, or survey analysis. The theoretical underpinnings or implications are not specified other than their suggesting possible inconsistencies in role performance if principals were to do what was expected, e.g. "the principal must serve as an advocate for people who are criticizing the very school structure or policies which he has helped to create and which he administers" (p. 18).

Our impression, on the basis of the works which we examined, is that the community school principal model stems from humanistic management models (e.g. McGregor, 1960; Blake and Mouton, 1964). While the models per se are no doubt adequate because they are grounded empirically in business and industrial organization studies and conceptually in humanistic psychology, there is a need to examine the settings in which any one of these models is to be used. One might take as an example the model of leadership style for the community school principal presented by Buirden and Whitt (1973) and also by Seay (Chapt. IV, 1974); this model is characterized by a human relations orientation, maintenance of an open climate vis-a-vis all members of the school community, positive staff reinforcement and collective planning and decision-making. However, the authors do not discuss the rationale or the implications of this model. At the risk of becoming repetitive, we again ask the proponents of these models: what preconditions must there be before community and school can begin to share? Under what conditions can these characteristics be developed? In other words, the models should include an analysis of the relationship between the setting of the school and its community, and the principal's role. The community school principal studies, it seems, would be improved if they adopted the approach taken by the school principal role analyses (in particular Boles and Davenport, 1975) where relationships between societal and school values and practices are investigated and the implications of these relationships are noted vis-a-vis specific community-school principal role performances.

Implications of the Review

We see areas which must be addressed in the examination of the principal's role. Foremost is the examination of empirical data regarding the setting in which the principal performs his/her role. The role of the principal cannot be fragmented and the parts examined separately - rather the total set of responsibilities must be examined. A second area relates to generalizability - if we are going to talk of the role of the principal, our data base must be made up from the various sub-populations of principals, e.g. male/female, elementary/secondary. A third area relates to the theoretical aspect or defining or positing models of principalship - at this time comprehensive models have not yet been formulated.

The task is both complex and mammoth. The total task is beyond the scope of this project. What we purport to do is to begin to develop the empirical base from which such models can be developed. Accordingly we look at how Ontario school principals see their role, asking them to identify activities - school and community-school exchanges - which may constitute the setting for their work.

3 Methodology

This chapter describes the practical details of our research. In carrying out the survey of Ontario school principals, we were involved in four main types of activities: questionnaire design, sampling procedures, field relations, and data analysis. The discussion will follow these four topics respectively.

Questionnaire Design

Our research design required that we gather data around two basic themes. The first of these concerned the principal's perceptions of his overall role in the school as a whole. The other theme concerned community-related activities at the school and the principal's involvement in and attitudes towards these activities.

A thorough search of past research concerning the topics of the principalship and of community involvement in schools was carried out. No directly applicable instruments such as questionnaires or interview designs were found. However, a few items in previous surveys of the principal's role were somewhat relevant. Upon considerable adaptation, some of these items were incorporated into our questionnaire.[1]

The overwhelming majority of the items were of our own design. Many of them were adaptations from a variety of questionnaires used in our research of the past few years, particularly in the field of community-school relations.[2]

---

[1] Sources used in designing the questionnaire included: Ellis (1972); Goldsborough et al. (1971); Melton (1971); N.E.A. (1968); Scott (1965); and Smilanich (1973).

[2] See Clifford et al. (1974, 1975).

The first preliminary version of the questionnaire was tested with representatives of a number of Provincial teachers' federations. We met with these individuals and received many suggestions both for new items and for alterations in existing ones.

Successive versions of the questionnaire were given, as well, to the Ministry of Education officials responsible for supervising this project. These individuals examined the items from the perspective of their expertise, which was mainly in the field of community involvement in schools. During a number of meetings with them, the questionnaire became progressively modified.

A revised copy of the questionnaire was pretested by six principals in an Eastern Ontario county. Comments and suggestions made on these questionnaires were helpful.

The final version of the questionnaire was translated into the French language. The translator was a person familiar with educational terminology used in the Province. The translation was proof-read by a second person with the same expertise - in this case a professor at a faculty of education.

Both versions of the questionnaire - English and French - were printed in booklet form. A copy of the English version may be found in Appendix A.

Sampling Procedures

Our initial sample was to be drawn on the basis of a stratified random selection procedure. The stratification was necessary in order to insure that the sample would be representative not only of all principals in the Province, but of a number of sub-groups as well. Our research design required that we compare schools of a number of different types: elementary versus secondary level schools; Public versus Separate schools; and English versus French language schools. Our sampling procedures had to provide us with sufficiently large numbers of schools of all of these types to allow us to generalize about each type and to draw comparisons among the different types. We consulted a statistician from the Planning and Research Branch of the Ministry of Education for advice on selection and sampling procedures. It was decided that sample sizes from each stratum would be weighed as follows: Public elementary schools - 20%; secondary schools in the Public system - 40%; Roman Catholic Separate and Private schools at the secondary level - 100%; and Roman Catholic elementary French language schools - 40%.

Before samples could be drawn, it was necessary to obtain completed listings of all schools in the Province. The official Ministry of Education directory of schools (Directory of Education, 1976-7) provided separate listings for elementary level schools (K-Grade 8) and secondary level schools (Grades 9-13) in the Public system. Schools in the Roman Catholic Separate system were not differentiated in the same way in the directory. All French language schools from K-Grade 10 were listed in one group. Roman Catholic Separate schools in the Province receive public support only to the Grade 10 level. Many of these schools do offer a full secondary level program (Grades 9-13). When they do, the program portion from Grade 11-13 is administered by a Private School Board. The Ministry Directory lists 11-13 schools as Private Schools. We listed all Roman Catholic Separate schools at the elementary level (K-Grade 8) and, as well, those which offered higher grades (Grade 9 and up). The latter were listed together as secondary level schools, regardless of whether they were officially identified as being under Separate Schools and/or Private School Boards.

In order to facilitate description of our data with reference to elementary versus secondary distinctions, a few schools which encompassed grades at both levels (e.g. Grades 7-11) were eliminated from the list. Also excluded from the target samples were alternative schools, adult secondary schools, Canadian Forces Base schools, Hospital schools and schools for the Trainable Retarded.

An examination of the Directory's list of French language schools showed that the overwhelming majority of these were at the elementary level and in the Separate School system. We excluded from our sample the small number of French language schools which did not fall into this description.

When all sub-lists were numbered, the random samples were drawn, yielding the following numbers:

English Language / Elementary Level / Public System:
20% or 525

English Language / Secondary Level / Public System:
40% or 201

English Language / Elementary Level / Roman Catholic Separate School System
20% or 191

English Language / Secondary Level / Roman Catholic Separate School System & Private School Boards
100% or 56

French Language / Elementary Level / Roman Catholic Separate School System
40% or 112

Total number of principals in sample - 1085

After sampling had been completed, the Ministry asked us to expand the scope of the study in order to include the sex variable. The addendum necessitated the drawing of a random sample of the female principals. The identification of this larger population proved to be considerably more problematic than had those of the other sub-groups.

Eventually, a nearly complete list was compiled by use of a complex procedure which included the tracing of titles from several years of the Ministry's Directory of Education, the consulting of several teachers' federations and the telephoning of a small number of school Boards. We feel certain that to the best of our knowledge, our list included 90% or more of all female principals in the Province. Their numbers were as follows:

Public / Elementary level:	166
Public / Secondary level:	9
Roman Catholic Separate / Private Schools all levels:	359

The lists were numbered and the random sample was drawn so as to yield a 50% sample of the female principals in the Province. Included in this 50% were the small number of female principals who had been selected as part of our original sample. All female principals at the secondary level were included as well. (A more detailed discussion of the sampling procedures and response rates for female principals appears in Chapter 6.) Our final sample of female principals numbered 273.

Field Relations

As soon as our original sample of principals had been drawn, we contacted their school Boards by letter. In our letter, addressed to the Director of Education, we explained the nature of the proposed research and requested the Board's cooperation. Boards could indicate their approval of our study either by replying to us affirmatively, or by not indicating by a given date that they objected. A total of 123 Directors of Education were sent these letters. Approximately one-half of these replied, granting approval. Only two of the Boards chose not to participate in our study. This reduced our sample by 38 schools. An additional 6 schools were eliminated by a few Boards who were willing to participate with the exception of one or two of their schools.

In addition to our letter, the Directors had been sent lists of those principals in their jurisdictions to whom questionnaires would be sent. After the female sample was drawn, these additional names were also forwarded, along with a letter of explanation regarding the nature of the addendum.

A small number of new Boards, selected in the female sample, were also sent letters comparable to the original one. No Boards expressed any objection to the female addendum to our study.

The actual mailing of the questionnaires was staggered over a period of about a month. Questionnaires to the original sample of 922 principals of English language schools were mailed out on April 20 - 22, 1976. Questionnaires to the 113 female principals drawn in the new sample were mailed on May 14, while the 101 French questionnaires were not sent until May 27.

Included with the questionnaire was a covering letter explaining the nature of the research, as well as a stamped, self-addressed return envelope.

Although the questionnaires were to be completed anonymously, an identification number had been placed on each questionnaire for administrative purposes. This allowed us to identify principals who did not return their completed questionnaires. Approximately two weeks after the initial mailing, those who had not yet responded were sent a letter of reminder. Response rates at this time were as follows:

Sample	Response Rate 2 weeks after mailing
English / Original Sample	45%
Female Addendum	30%
French	40%

By mid-June, the rates of response, with the exception of the Female Addendum group, had grown to satisfactory levels. Since only 61% of the latter group had returned questionnaires by that time, non-respondents were sent a second reminder, this time with a new copy of the questionnaire enclosed.

The survey was closed in mid-July. Final response rates, which were encouragingly high, are shown in Figure I below. Figure I summarizes the sampling procedures and the response rates for all five sub-groups in our sampling population. Not included in this Figure are the statistics for the Female Addendum. Because of the relative complexity of the sampling procedures which were necessary to allow us to make Male-Female comparisons, relevant statistics for that sampling will be presented, in detail, in Chapter 6.

Figure I. Summary of Sampling Procedures and Response Rates.

Groups	# in Ont. Pop.	% in Sample	Original Sample Size	Final* Sample Size	Number Responding	% Response
Public School System						
Elementary (English)	2626	20%	525	484	399	82.4%
Secondary (English)	502	40%	201	194	158	81.4%
Separate School System						
Elementary (English)	955	20%	191	188	144	76.5%
Elementary (French)	279	40%	112	101	75	74.3%
Secondary (English)	56	100%	56	56	49	87.5%
Totals	4418		1085	1023	825	80.6%

* Boards declining participation, and untraceable addresses account for this loss of 62 schools from the original sample.

Data Analysis

When the survey was closed at mid-July, the data were transferred to computer cards. This necessitated the coding of all open-ended responses. Two coders were employed for this purpose. When coding had been completed, a 10% check of questionnaires showed an error rate of less than 1%. Errors found were corrected.

There had been some open-ended type questions to which response rates had been too low to justify coding. For these questions, coders kept complete lists of responses.

In addition, typical verbatim comments were found for all open-ended questions which had been coded. In the selection of these comments, coders followed the rule that a sample of comments illustrating all possible ideas (or codes) be obtained. In this way, a list of comments ranging from one to five type-written pages, was obtained for each of these questions.

Once the data were transferred to computer cards, a number of statistical procedures were performed. A packaged computer program[3] was employed by the researchers.

Our research proposal called for the examination of our data in terms of five types of independent variables: school level (elementary vs. secondary), school system (Public vs. Separate), school language (French vs. English), community type (urban vs. rural), and sex of principal (male vs. female). The first three of these variables were also the bases for our original sampling of principals. We had drawn random samples, independently, from five different types of schools. Since we had used different sampling proportions (i.e. 20%, 40% or 100%) for the five sub-groups, it was necessary to look separately at the way

---

3. See Nie et al. (1970).

each group responded to the questionnaire. Comparisons could be made between sub-groups, but it was not possible to look at our entire sample in terms of a single independent variable at one time.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study in terms of these five sub-groups. Where relevant, comparisons between the groups will be made. Where no significant differences exist, we will be able to generalize to all principals, but usually, we will only attempt to generalize to particular sub-groups.

Chapter 5 will examine urban-rural differences. This variable was not one upon which sampling was based. Instead, a set of "pure types" of urban and of rural schools were selected for this set of comparisons. Only part of our sample is used for these analyses. This will be explained further in Chapter 5.

Chapter 6 will look at male-female differences in response to our questionnaire. For this set of analyses, a data base which is larger than for the rest of the study, will be employed. The extra principals are the additional female principals who were selected after the original sampling had been completed. As with the urban-rural comparisons, the details of this set of analyses will be given in the relevant chapter.

Wherever relevant through the report, we will use verbatim comments taken directly from principals' questionnaires. These will provide direct illustrations of the ways that the principals commented on the questionnaire topics.

When we make generalizations, we will attempt to support them with statistical tables embedded in the text.

4 Basic Findings for the Five Types of Schools

Introduction

In this chapter, we will describe the main findings of our survey of Ontario school principals. These findings will be presented in three main sections.

The first section will describe the setting in which the principals find themselves - the sizes of their schools, the type of students, the nature of the communities which the schools serve. It will also present the backgrounds of the principals themselves - their personal and professional characteristics.

The second section of the chapter will give our findings about the nature and extent of all those types of activities in these schools which relate directly to the parents and to the communities of these schools. Included in this section will be descriptions of parent-school communication, community-related aspects of the school curriculum, formal organizations dealing with school-community relationship, and extra services provided by the school for the community.

In the third and last section of the chapter, we will focus on the role of the principal in this setting. We will describe how he/she now allocates his/her time among different activities; the degree to which he/she now shares decision-making with other school groups, the way he/she would prefer to do all of the above, and the factors which he/she considers both helpful and constraining in his/her situation. In addition, the principal's particular role in, and attitude toward different aspects of school-community relations will be discussed.

Findings will be presented in terms of percentages of principals, in each of five types of schools, who responded in given ways to items on our questionnaire. Statistical tables will accompany all generalizations. Tables will show response patterns of all five sub-groups: Public elementary school principals; secondary school principals in the Public system; Separate elementary school principals (both English and French); and R.C./Pr.[1] school principals. Because of varying response rates for different questions, total numbers of principals will vary from table to table. When the non-response rate is greater than 10%, this will be noted.

In interpreting the findings presented here, the reader should remember certain limitations of this study. Five random samples were drawn from five types of schools. Each of these samples can be considered representative of all schools of that type only. For example, from our sample of elementary school principals teaching in the Public system, we may generalize to all such schools in the province. However, we cannot with equal confidence generalize about the Province from the average of our entire sample. For one thing, certain special types of schools were excluded. For example, our French-language schools are all of the Separate elementary type and so we are not able to say anything about the relatively few other types of French language schools in the Province, nor about schools which combine French- and English-language instruction. Also, principals from different sub-groups were sampled in different proportions (e.g. 20%, 40%, 100%) and we cannot combine their answers without a complex weighting procedure. On the other hand the very high response rates to the survey (80% overall) make us very confident of our ability to generalize within these five subgroups. A summary of the findings presented in each of the three main sections of this chapter will be given at the conclusion of each.

---

[1] We use the abbreviation R.C./Pr. to designate those secondary level schools administered by a Roman Catholic Separate School Board (Gr. 9-10) and a Private School Board (Gr. 11-13). For a more comprehensive explanation, see pages 5 and 6.

40

40

Section 1

SETTINGS OF ONTARIO SCHOOLS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR PRINCIPALS

(a) School and Community Characteristics

In this section, we will describe some basic characteristics of Ontario schools and of their principals.

First, we will examine some characteristics of the schools themselves. Table I displays the proportions of small, medium, and large schools that exist for each of the five types of schools in the Province. As expected, secondary schools tend to be much larger than elementary schools. Less than 3% of any of the three types of elementary schools is large (over 800 pupils). The majority of secondary schools in the Public system (71%) are of this size. One quarter of R.C./Pr. schools are also large, but an equal proportion are small (under 400 students), while the remaining one-half are of medium size (400-800). R.C./Pr. schools tend to be considerably smaller than those in the Public system.

There is a similar though weaker tendency for Separate schools to be smaller than Public ones at the elementary level. While 62% of Public elementary schools are small (and nearly all others are of medium size), 75% of Separate elementary English language schools are of this size. The smallest units are the Separate elementary French language schools (91% - small).

While the size of the administrative staff of a school is largely related to the size of its student body, it is nevertheless interesting to look at the distribution of vice-principals among our five subgroups (see Table 2). As might be expected, schools at the secondary level are much more likely to have vice-principals than are elementary schools.

TABLE 1: School Size for 5 Types of Schools

School Size	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Small (to 400 stud.)	62.1	75.0	90.7	6.4	25.0
Medium (400-800 stud.)	35.3	22.2	9.3	22.3	50.0
Large (over 800 stud.)	2.6	2.8	0.0	71.3	25.0
Total Number of Respondents	399	144	75	157	48

TABLE 2: Number of Vice-Principals in 5 Types of Schools

Number of Vice-Principals					
None	54.3	74.6	77.3	7.7	14.6
One	44.4	23.9	21.3	51.0	66.7
Two	1.3	1.4	1.4	41.3	18.8
Total Number of Respondents	387	142	75	155	48

TABLE 3: Grade Levels* Served by 5 Types of Schools

Grade Levels					
K - 6	52.1	92.2	40.0	--	--
K - 8 (or 7,8)	47.9	70.8	60.0	--	--
9 - 11	--	--	--	3.2	12.2
9 - 13	--	--	--	96.8	87.8
Total Number of Respondents	399	144	75	158	49

The few schools which encompassed both elementary and secondary grades were excluded from our sample.

H2

Practically no elementary schools have two vice-principals; 44% of those in the Public system have one. By contrast, less than one-quarter of Separate elementary schools, either French or English language, have vice-principals. While most secondary schools have vice-principals, 41% of those in the Public system have two, in contrast to R.C./Pr. ones where only 19% have two. Although in part, these relationships may be strictly related to school size, they do have at least one implication, when we consider sources of help for a principal attempting to free more time for community-related activities.

Table 3 shows the grade levels taught in each of the five types of schools. Among elementary schools, those in the Public system are as likely to go up only to Grade 6 as to go all the way to Grade 8. French language Separate schools tend slightly to include the senior grades (60%), while English language Separate schools are even more likely to do so (71%). Thus, the junior elementary school exists primarily in the Public system.

Nearly all schools which offer secondary education include the grades from 9 to 13. Only 12% of R.C./Pr. schools do not include Grades 12 and 13, an interesting fact when one considers that these schools must rely on private funding for the support of these grades.

Table 4 shows the populations of the cities or towns where the schools are located. Public schools - both elementary and secondary - are about equally distributed among small, medium, and large size towns and cities. There are large differences, however, between the distribution of schools in the Separate/Private systems.[1] At the elementary level, English schools are approximately evenly distributed among communities of different size. Approximately 33% of the French language schools, on the other hand, are in small towns of less than 10,000 population. Very

---

[1] We use the expression Separate/Private Systems to cover the situation of an elementary and secondary school program administered by a Roman Catholic System school Board (K-10) and a Private Roman Catholic Secondary School Board (11-13). For a more comprehensive explanation, see pages 5 and 6.

TABLE 4: Population of Town for 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Town Population					
Less than 10,000	37.1	26.1	66.7	32.5	4.2
10,000 to 90,000	28.0	33.1	13.3	34.4	33.4
100,000 or more	34.8	40.8	20.0	33.2	62.6
Total Number of Respondents	396	142	75	157	48

TABLE 5: Community Type for 5 Types of Schools

Community Type					
Small town/Rural	40.0	30.5	64.0	44.0	12.5
Suburban	26.7	30.6	13.3	26.1	39.6
Old Residential	16.6	18.1	5.3	12.1	8.3
Down-town	8.3	16.0	13.3	8.9	6.3
Mixed (2 or 3 types)	8.3	4.9	4.0	8.9	33.4
Total Number of Respondents	397	144	75	157	48

few of these all-French schools are found in major urban centres (20%). By contrast, the majority of R.C./Pr. schools (63%) are found in such major urban centres and only 4% of them are in smaller places.

In addition to the size of the population of the place where schools were located, principals were asked to describe the particular types of communities (down-town, suburban, old residential, small town, and rural) which their schools were serving. Table 5 displays these types of communities for the schools of the five different types. As with population size, there is little difference in the distribution of elementary and secondary Public schools among different types of communities. About 25% of these schools are located in suburban settings; about 15% in old residential ones, less than 10% are "down-town", and around 40% are in mainly rural settings. In the Separate/Private systems, English-language elementary schools have a distribution similar to that above, except for a slight tendency to have fewer schools in rural areas, and consequently have a rather different pattern, with 64% located in rural areas. R.C./Pr. schools, on the other hand, are more likely to be located in the suburbs than is any other group (40%). Nearly as many (33%) serve "mixed" areas; that is, they tend to draw their students from two or three different types of communities.

Table 6 shows the occupation of the family head of students in each of the five types of schools. There is a surprising similarity in the patterns in which different occupational types are distributed among the schools. About 12% of all types of schools, with the exception of the French language ones, have major proportions (over 50%) of their students coming from a home where the head of the family is at a professional/managerial level. Only 1% of French schools have such a proportion. Even as a minor proportion (10% to 50%), this occupational group is found only in 18% of French language schools. In 71% of R.C./Pr. schools, on the other hand, there are minor proportions of families where the family head is a professional. The clerical occupational group is found, as a major proportion, in about 30% of all types of schools, with the exception, again, of the French language schools, where only 17% have this. Even as a minor proportion, fewer French language schools draw from families having family heads in clerical jobs (40%) than do all other types of schools (approx. 58%). The majority of rural and farming occupational groups are found in about 10% of all types of schools, with the exception of R.C./Pr. schools, where there are no schools with this population. This occupational group is found, as a minor proportion, in about 15% of all types of schools, with the exception of Public secondary schools (33%). The manual/unskilled occupational group is found, as a major proportion, in about 16% of most schools, with the exception of Separate elementary schools, which have higher percentages in this category. In 33% of English language and 58% of French language Separate elementary schools, there are major proportions of students coming from homes where the family head is an unskilled or manual labourer.

Principals were asked, as well, to indicate the ethnic make-up of the families in their schools. Again, there was a distinction between major proportion (over 50%) and minor proportion (10% - 50%). Ethnic groups which represent less than 10% of a school's population were not considered in this survey. Tables 7 and 8 show the relation between ethnic types and school types. Table 7 displays the breakdown of majority ethnic groups (more than 50% in the school), while Table 8 shows the variation in minority ethnic groups in different types of schools. As might be expected, English-speaking student populations form the great majority of students in the Province's schools. Within the Public system, an overwhelming 95% of schools have English majorities. Other language groups are more commonly found, in major proportions, among schools in the Separate/Private systems. Of course, as one would expect, nearly all (92%) of French-language schools have French pupils in the majority. Perhaps more puzzling is the fact that 8% have English pupils in the majority. A number of Separate/Private schools have majority student populations of Southern European background (Italian, Portuguese, Greek, etc.). About one-fifth of Separate elementary, and

TABLE 6: Occupation of Family Head of Students in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Family Head Occupation					
Professional					
-major prop. (over 50%)	12.8	11.2	1.4	11.5	12.2
-minor prop. (10% - 50%)	41.2	30.1	17.6	41.2	71.4
Clerical					
-major prop. (over 50%)	30.9	28.0	16.2	26.8	38.8
-minor prop. (10% - 50%)	55.3	55.2	39.2	62.7	59.2
Rural/Farm					
-major prop. (over 50%)	12.1	7.7	16.2	16.3	0.0
-minor prop. (10% - 50%)	18.3	16.1	16.2	33.3	10.2
Manual/Unskilled					
-major prop. (over 50%)	19.8	32.9	58.1	16.3	14.3
-minor prop.	42.5	33.6	22.9	51.6	36.7
Total Number of Respondents	398	143	74	153	49

TABLE 7: Ethnic Types Forming Majority Groups (over 50%) in 5 Types of Schools

Ethnic Types					
English	95.5	77.6	8.3	95.7	69.6
French	0.5	3.2	91.7	0.7	0.0
Native People	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0
South. Europe	1.1	16.8	0.0	0.7	26.1
East. Europe	0.5	0.8	0.0	1.4	2.2
North. Europe	0.5	1.6	0.0	0.7	2.2
Oriental	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	378	125	72	140	46

TABLE 8: Ethnic Types Forming Minority Groups (10% to 50%) in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (#)*	Separate English (#)	Separate French (#)	Public (#)	R.C./Pr. (#)**
Ethnic Types					
English	32	31	30	17	15
French	19	25	9	18	11
Native	19	2	0	11	0
South. Europe	45	49	0	33	23
East. Europe	14	7	0	6	4
North. Europe	53	8	0	34	3
Oriental	9	1	0	2	1
Arab	4	0	0	0	0
Other	17	2	0	2	0
Total Number of Respondents	151	94	36	86	39

* Numbers, rather than percentages are given in this table for two reasons: schools could name either one or two minority ethnic groups, and over half of all schools reported having no ethnic minority.

** This number refers to those who have one or two minorities.

one-quarter of R.C./Pr. schools have Southern Europeans as majority student populations. Among all school types, with the exception of French language schools, there are a number of schools with other ethnic majorities. It is interesting to note that a very small proportion of the schools in the Province have such ethnic majorities as Native Peoples, Eastern European, Northern European and Oriental. Of course, an even greater variety of these and other ethnic types exist, in minority proportions, in many schools throughout the Province. See Table 8 for a breakdown of ethnic minority groups in different types of schools.

(b) Principals' Characteristics

Having looked at some basic characteristics of five different types of Ontario schools, let us now examine the characteristics of the principals of these schools.

Table 9 shows the ages of principals in the five types of schools. Approximately half of the principals in each of the five types of schools are between 35 and 45 years of age. The others are more likely to be older in secondary schools and younger in elementary schools. The Separate elementary schools (both French and English language) have the greatest proportion of principals under 35 years of age (30%). Only 14% of Public elementary schools and very few secondary schools of either type have principals of this age.

Table 10 shows the sex of the principal in each of the five types of schools. Male principals are clearly more prevalent in most types of schools than are female principals. The only exceptions to this are the R.C./Pr. schools where we find an equal proportion of men and women. Schools in the Public system have extremely low proportions of female principals (6% at the elementary level, and only 1% at the secondary level).

TABLE 9: Age of Principals in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Age of Principal					
Less than 35 years	13.6	29.2	31.6	1.3	6.4
35-45 years	49.4	50.0	46.1	40.6	51.1
Over 45 years	32.0	20.8	21.1	58.1	42.5
Total Number of Respondents	397	144	76	155	47

TABLE 10: Sex of Principal in 5 Types of Schools

Sex of Principal					
Male	94.5	74.3	70.6	98.7	51.0
Female	5.5	25.7	29.4	1.3	49.0
Total Number of Respondents	397	144	75	156	49

TABLE 11: Education of Principals in 5 Types of Schools

Education					
B.A. or less	21.6	20.3	25.3	17.9	0.0
M.A./M.Ed. begun	34.6	39.9	38.7	46.8	49.0
M.A./M.Ed. completed or higher	43.9	39.9	36.0	35.3	51.0
Total Number of Respondents	399	143	75	156	49

Table 11 shows the educational backgrounds of the principals in each of the five types of schools. There are no real differences in this respect among principals of different types of schools, with the exception of R.C./Pr. schools, whose principals have the highest educational level. All of these principals have more than a B.A., and one-half of these have received an M.A. or have even wider educational backgrounds. In all other groups, about one-fifth have B.A. or less; about two-fifths have more than a B.A. but less than an M.A.; the remaining 40% have an M.A. or more.

Table 12 displays the relationship between numbers of years spent as a vice-principal and type of school in which the principal is located. Approximately half of the principals in three types of schools (elementary - Public and Separate English language, and R.C./Pr.) were never vice-principals. The same is true of nearly all principals of Separate French-language elementary schools. On the other hand, only 15% of Public system secondary school principals were never vice-principals. These principals were also likely to have been vice-principals for a longer period of time than were those in other groups, with half of them having served for four or more years as vice-principal. These relationships may be explained, at least in part, when we consider the relative availability of the vice-principal's positions in these school types (see Table 2).

Table 13 shows the length of time that the respondents in different types of schools have been principal. There are only a few differences between groups in this regard. R.C./Pr. school principals, as a group, have spent less time as principals (52% - less than 5 years) than have those in all other groups (30% - less than 5 years). The most experienced group is at the Public elementary level, where 44% have been principals for more than ten years.

Table 14 shows the number of years for which principals have been in their present schools. Principals of English-language elementary

TABLE 12: Number of Years Spent as Vice-Principal by Principals of 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public	Separate English	Separate French	Public	R.C./Pr.
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Years as V.P.					
Never V.P.	41.8	56.3	93.3	15.5	54.2
1 year	10.6	10.4	1.3	6.5	10.4
2-3 years	23.0	22.2	4.0	28.4	12.5
4-5 years	12.7	6.3	0.0	30.3	18.8
6 years or more	12.0	4.9	1.3	19.4	4.2
Total Number of Respondents	395	144	75	155	48

TABLE 13: Years as Principal for 5 Types of Schools

Years as Principal					
1-5 years	23.6	36.2	31.1	37.7	51.5
6-10 years	32.9	34.7	41.9	37.7	28.6
more than 10 years	43.5	29.2	27.1	24.6	20.4
Total Number of Respondents	395	144	74	154	49

TABLE 14: Years as Principal at Present School for 5 Types of Schools

Years at Present School					
3 years or less	47.6	51.4	29.3	26.2	18.3
4-10 years	40.7	38.9	57.3	45.5	26.7
11 years or more	11.9	9.7	13.3	28.2	44.9
Total Number of Respondents	399	144	75	156	49

schools within both Public and Separate systems appear to be the most mobile group. One-half of these principals have spent three years or less at their present schools. By contrast, only 30% of French-language elementary school principals have spent only this short time at their present schools. Nearly 60% of them have stayed from 4 to 10 years. The more restricted nature of opportunities for principals of French-language schools may explain their reduced mobility. Principals at the secondary school level appear to stay in their schools for longer periods of time than do those in elementary schools. Three-quarters or more of the former have spent four or more years at their schools. Least mobile of all are the R.C./Pr. school principals - 45% of these principals have stayed in their present schools for 11 years or more.

(c) Summary of Findings Presented in Section 1

This concludes the basic description of the five types of schools and their principals. The main findings about each group are summarized below:

Public elementary schools tend to be small. They tend to be found in all sizes and types of communities, and they tend to have students from homes of all types of occupational groupings. The majority of their students are English-speaking. Their principals tend to be males who were never vice-principals, but who have spent the longest time, of all groups, as principals. They tend to be quite mobile.

English-language Separate elementary schools are small and tend to have no vice-principals. About half of them go to Grade 6, while the rest go to Grade 8. They are found in all types and sizes of communities. They have mainly English-speaking students, but Southern European groups form a majority in some schools. Their principals tend to be young and male, but many females hold these positions as well. They are a mobile group who were rarely vice-principals.

Separate elementary French language schools are the smallest of all types of schools. They rarely have vice-principals. They generally encompass all grades from Kindergarten to Grade 8. Relative to the other school types, very few of these schools have significant proportions of students from professional families. Rather, the occupation of the students' family head tends to be manual and unskilled labour. Most students come from French-speaking homes. Principals tend to be young, and in a majority of cases, male. Most have never been vice-principals.

Secondary schools in the Public system are relatively large, with one or two vice-principals. Most encompass Grades 9 to 13. They are found in all types and sizes of communities and English-speaking students form the majority in most of these schools. Principals tend to be older, and nearly exclusively male. Most have been vice-principals. A majority have been in the same school as principal for at least four years.

R.C./Pr. schools, on the other hand, tend to be of medium size. They usually have one vice-principal and encompass Grades 9 to 13. Most are found in large communities. Here, they serve suburban populations or draw students from mixed (in terms of ethnic composition) communities. Although English is the language of the majority of the students in most schools, there are many schools where other ethnic groups, most often Southern Europeans, form the majority. Principals in R.C./Pr. schools tend to be older. There is a balance of male and female principals. They are the most educated group of principals of the five types. They were rarely vice-principals, and have had little mobility as principals.

Section 2

THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF COMMUNITY-RELATED ACTIVITIES IN ONTARIO SCHOOLS

In this section, we will describe a different type of school and community activities and relationships. Once again, the nature and extent of these activities and relationships will be shown separately for each of five types of Ontario schools. Five different areas of community-school relationships will be explored in this section, which will end with a summary of findings.

(a) Communication with Parents

Communication between school and parents can take many forms. It can be originated by the school or by the parent. It can be regular or sporadic, formal or informal. Parents may be involved in such school-related activities as volunteer work or the provision of special services. Various aspects of this involvement are explored throughout Section 2 of this chapter. In part (a), the discussion is limited to only one facet of such communications - that of the giving out of information by the school about its basic daytime program.

The most common and probably most widespread aspect of school-community relationships is the school-originated communication directed at the parents of students attending the school. Principals were asked about a number of different facets of this type of communication in their schools.

Table 15 shows the number of written communications about school activities which schools of different types had sent to parents during the school year in which the survey was conducted (i.e. 1975/1976). These communications did not include the usual required report card, but included other types of written material such as newsletters. One or more were sent by nearly all schools of all types in our survey.

Elementary schools sent more than did secondary schools. Nearly 90% of all three types of elementary schools indicated that they had sent five or more such communications to their pupils' homes. Only 20% of secondary schools in the Public system and 35% of R.C./Pr. schools had done so. About 25% of both types of schools where secondary subjects are taught said they had sent one or two. Nearly 50% of secondary schools in the Public system and over one-third of R.C./Pr. schools said that they had sent three or more.

Table 16 shows the number of times per week that principals in different types of schools talk with parents. These talks are conducted by the principal, in person or over the telephone. There are no major differences between the types of schools with respect to this variable. Three-quarters or more of principals of all types of schools talk with parents once a day or more often. Less than 10% of principals, in any type of school, talk with parents as rarely as only once a week or less. The subject of these communications is varied, with the greatest concentration being in the area of individual student progress and discipline. Approximately 60% of principals indicated that this is the main topic of their conversations with parents. Other topics included reasons for absences, P.T.A. related discussions, giving out of information, social talks, and other matters related to school. These topics were mentioned as being the main ones, by only 5% or fewer principals in each case.[1]

Table 17 shows the number of times each year that the schools hold "open houses" or other organized opportunities, other than parent-teacher interviews,[2] for parents to see how the schools operate. While

---

1. No table is given for "topics" of conversation, as no differences between groups were observed.

2. We have not included parent-teacher interviews because they are common to most schools.

TABLE 15: Number of Newsletters Sent Home in School Year 1975/76 in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public	Separate English	Separate French	Public	R.C./Pr.
# of Newsletters	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
None	0.5	2.1	3.9	8.3	6.1
One or two	1.5	2.8	1.3	23.7	22.4
Three or four	9.8	7.0	8.0	48.7	36.7
Five or more	88.2	88.1	86.7	19.2	34.7
Total Number of Respondents	399	143	76	156	49

TABLE 16: Principal's Weekly Talks with Parents in 5 Types of Schools

# of Talks					
Several times per day	50.0	38.2	45.3	32.5	32.7
Once a day	34.2	37.5	32.0	42.0	40.8
Every few days	11.8	18.8	13.3	18.5	22.4
Once a week or less	3.5	5.6	9.3	7.0	4.1
Total Number of Respondents	398	144	75	157	49

TABLE 17: Organized Parent Visits per Year in 5 Types of Schools

# of Parent Visits					
Never	1.8	3.5	4.1	4.5	12.5
Annual	21.7	23.9	23.0	40.1	27.1
Semi-Annual	28.0	22.5	20.3	27.4	27.1
More than 2/year	48.6	50.0	52.7	28.0	33.3
Total Number of Respondents	397	142	74	157	48

most schools of all types hold some such event each year, elementary schools tend to hold more of them than do secondary schools. One-half of all three types of elementary schools hold more than two parent nights or similar occasions each year, whereas only one-third or less of secondary schools do so. In 40% of secondary schools in the Public system, there is only one such event per year.

Table 18 shows the number of student performances, such as concerts, plays, and variety shows, that are sponsored each year by the different types of schools. Although most schools put on some performances each year, there are differences in the number put on by the five types of schools. Secondary schools have more such performances than do elementary schools. One-half of both types of secondary schools have four or more performances each year. By comparison, only about one-quarter of the English language elementary schools in both systems do so. French language elementary schools put on the fewest number of performances of all (7% have none, and 43% have one).

Table 19 shows the frequency with which schools of different types make use of their community media, such as newspaper, radio, and television. While the great majority of schools do make use of these media, secondary schools tend to do so more often than do elementary. Nearly 40% of secondary schools in the Public system, and 30% of R.C./Pr. schools said they used these media "often", while 39% of both types said they used them "sometimes." Only 4% of these schools said they "never" used the media. This contrasts with elementary schools where between 12% and 28% indicated they never used media. Lowest of all 3 types of elementary schools, in terms of media use, is is the French language group (29% "never" and 43% "seldom"). Only one-quarter (25%) of the French language schools indicated they used media "sometimes," in contrast with both types of English language elementary schools where 40% or more did so.

TABLE 18: Yearly Plays, Concerts or Other Student Performances in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
# of Performances					
None	1.8	3.5	6.8	0.0	0.0
One	21.6	31.7	43.3	8.3	16.7
Two	28.2	28.9	29.7	17.8	22.9
Three	20.3	15.5	12.2	25.5	10.4
Four or more	28.2	20.4	7.5	48.4	50.0
Total Number of Respondents	394	142	74	157	48

TABLE 19: Use of Community Media by 5 Types of Schools

Use of Media					
Never	11.8	18.9	27.8	3.8	4.1
Seldom	32.5	26.6	43.1	17.7	28.6
Sometimes	40.1	44.8	25.0	39.2	38.8
Often	15.6	9.8	5.5	39.2	28.6
Total Number of Respondents	397	143	72	158	49

TABLE 20: Community Issues in Curriculum of 5 Types of Schools

Community Issues					
School-wide policy	40.0	33.8	45.3	53.5	44.9
Some classes only	51.4	56.3	45.3	43.3	49.0
Not considered	8.6	9.9	9.3	3.2	6.1
Total Number of Respondents	395	142	75	157	49

(b) Community-oriented Curriculum

A second area of school-community communications, and one which is not generally discussed in the community school literature, concerns those aspects of the daytime school's curriculum which have some emphasis on the surrounding community or which are affected by it. A number of questions on the principals' questionnaire explored this topic.

Principals were asked whether it was a practice, at their schools, to have aspects of the school curriculum reflect local cultural, socio-economic, or other issues. Table 20 displays the results of the principals' answers to this question. Most schools appear to have at least a degree of local emphasis in the curriculum. Less than 10% of any of the school types indicated having no such emphasis. Of the remaining schools, about half say that this school practice follows a school-wide policy, while the other half indicate that although there is no school policy in this regard, some teachers are doing this in their own classes.

Table 21 shows the incidence of field trips to the local community in the five types of schools. These field trips include visits to local industries, outdoor science education excursions and any other events where students, through regular course-work, visit the community surrounding the school. With rare exceptions, all schools have made frequent trips to their communities. The schools which seem to make the most frequent use of field trips are the secondary ones in the Public system. Nearly three-quarters of these schools indicated "frequent" trips. The greater number of students and classes in these schools certainly accounts, at least in part, for this. Next most frequent are the Public elementary schools (57% - "frequently"). In Separate English language schools (both elementary and secondary), 40% of the principals responded "frequently." French language schools show the least use of field trips (only 25% - "frequently" and 30% - "once in a while"). With the latter exception, nearly all schools which do not have "frequent" field trips say that they have these at least "sometimes."

TABLE 21: Field Trips in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Field Trips					
Frequently	56.5	40.6	25.3	72.8	36.7
Sometimes	35.2	44.8	44.0	19.0	46.9
Once in a while	8.3	14.7	29.3	8.2	14.3
Never	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.0
Total Number of Respondents	398	143	75	158	49

TABLE 22: Courses With Out-of-School Components in Local Community in 5 Types of Schools

Outside Courses					
Some such courses	5.3	8.5	9.3	65.0	26.5
No such courses	94.7	91.5	90.7	35.0	73.5
Total Number of Respondents	347	142	75	157	49

Table 22 shows the incidence of having students work, on a regular basis, within the community, as part of their course work. Schools with Community Involvement Programs or work-study programs in local businesses or industries have such involvement. Such programs appear to exist, with some frequency, primarily in secondary schools. While less than 10% of elementary schools have such programs, almost two-thirds of secondary schools in the public system do so. R.C./Pr. schools have considerably lower incidence of such courses (27%) than do those in the Public system.

Another means of introducing community concerns into the school curriculum is that of having community resource persons come into the school to supplement the regular teaching program. Principals were asked about their use of volunteers in the school. Tables 23 and 24 show the incidence of the existence of two types of volunteer programs in these schools.

Table 23 shows the number of volunteers coming into the school on a regular basis. For example, these "regular" volunteers may be working in the library or in the classroom. Such volunteers are less likely to be present in secondary schools than in elementary ones. Approximately two-thirds of all secondary schools have no regular volunteers. A somewhat similar situation exists in the French-language schools. When these schools do have such a program, they are likely to have only a half-dozen or fewer volunteers. English-language elementary schools have more volunteers and use them more regularly. Over 80% of public elementary schools have a regular volunteer program, and half of these programs involve seven or more community members. Over two-thirds of Separate elementary schools have such programs, although the majority of these involve six or fewer individuals.

Principals were asked to distinguish between having "regular" volunteers, as defined above, and "occasional" volunteers. "Occasional" volunteers help out, when called, with such school requirements as driving or paperwork. Table 24 shows the use of occasional volunteers in different types of schools. Elementary schools tend to use such help more often than do secondary schools. However, the great majority of all types of schools do receive occasional help from volunteers. Only 5% or fewer elementary schools, 10% of R.C./Pr. schools and 20% of secondary schools in the Public system indicated that they had no such help. The secondary schools of the Public system are likely to use volunteers only a few times per year (47% do so) while R.C./Pr. schools use them monthly or more often (60% do so). Nearly all elementary schools use occasional volunteers, although not many do so as often as every week (one-quarter or less in each case do so). Most elementary schools use them "at least once a month."

Principals were also asked about the frequency with which visiting speakers came into their classrooms to talk about their areas of expertise. Table 25 shows the use of such speakers in the different types of schools. Nearly all schools appear to have such speakers, at least once in a while. No such practice was indicated by 5% or fewer schools of any type. One-half of the secondary schools in the Public system and two-thirds of the R.C./Pr. schools use speakers "frequently." Elementary schools are more likely to say they use speakers "sometimes" or "once in a while."

(c) Community Use of Facilities

Still another area of school-community interaction concerns the provision, within the school facility, of certain "extra" services which go beyond the regular daytime school program, e.g. community use of school space. One section of the principal questionnaire explored various facets of "community use of school facilities."

A number of the questions looked at the extent and type of after-hours activities offered for youth and/or adults within the schools. Table 26 displays the proportions of after-hours educational and/or recreational

TABLE 23: Regular Volunteers

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public	Separate English	Separate French	Public	R.C./Pr.
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
Regular Volunteers					
None	18.0	32.6	58.7	68.8	61.2
1-6	43.9	45.1	36.0	26.1	28.5
7 or more	38.1	22.2	5.3	5.1	10.2
Total Number of Respondents	399	144	75	157	49

TABLE 24: Occasional Volunteers

Occasional Volunteers					
Never	0.5	3.5	5.3	19.2	10.2
At least once/year	13.9	18.1	33.0	46.8	28.6
At least once/month	60.5	63.2	44.0	29.5	49.0
At least once/week	25.2	15.3	17.3	4.5	12.2
Total Number of Respondents	397	144	75	156	49

TABLE 25: Frequency of Use of Visiting Speakers in 5 Types of Schools

Visiting Speakers					
Frequently	22.1	9.7	12.0	65.2	49.0
Sometimes	48.2	45.8	44.0	29.1	44.9
Once in a while	27.4	41.7	37.3	5.7	6.1
Never	2.5	2.8	5.3	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	398	144	81	158	49

TABLE 26: After Hours Recreational and/or Educational Activities for Children/Teens and/or Adults in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Activities					
Some activities for children/teens	85.3	75.0	68.0	93.7	93.9
Some activities for adults	49.4	45.8	49.3	89.2	38.8
Total Number of Respondents	395	144	75	158	49

activities offered in different types of schools.[5] Activities for children and teenagers are much more commonly offered through the school than are those for adults. Over 66% of all types of schools have such activities for children or teens. Most likely to offer these are the secondary schools (94% in both types), followed by Public elementary schools (85%) and Separate elementary schools (75% in English language, and 68% in French language schools).

Adult activities are offered in about one-half of elementary schools of all types. Nearly all secondary schools in the Public system, on the other hand, have adult activities (89%). In great contrast to this are the R.C./Pr. schools where only 39% report having some adult-oriented activities.

The types of activities which are offered in these programs are shown in Tables 27 and 28, which display childrens' and adults' activities respectively. Percentages in these tables refer, as their base, only to schools which have one or more activities (see Table 26). That is, these tables show what proportion of schools with some activities are offering a particular type of program.

Let us look at the programs for children and teens first. The most common type of activity, and one which appears in over 80% of these schools (all types) is athletics. Secondary schools offer such a program almost without exception, as do the great majority (80% to 90%) of all the elementary schools. Special interest courses and clubs tend also to be more common at the secondary level. Three-quarters of secondary schools in the Public system offer such programs for youth, as do 60% of R.C./Pr. schools. Over one-half of Public elementary

---

[5] Some of these activities are offered by the school itself while others are provided by other agencies using the school facility. Information about the sponsorship and organization of these activities will be described later in Part (e) of this chapter.

TABLE 27: Types of After-Hours Activities for Children/Teenagers

	Elementary			Secondary	
Types	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Athletics	83.4	88.0	90.2	98.0	100.0
Interest clubs/ courses	53.7	38.9	23.5	75.7	58.7
Youth groups	63.8	51.9	47.0	33.1	32.6
Special events	43.9	28.7	35.3	68.9	78.3
Summer programs	54.0	28.7	49.0	58.8	30.4
Ethnic & cultural programs	8.9	25.9	21.6	20.4	21.7
Total Number of Respondents	337	108	51	148	46

TABLE 28: Types of Recreational/Educational Activities for Adults

Types					
Athletics	72.3	85.2	86.5	90.0	73.7
Interest clubs/ courses	54.4	28.8	43.2	79.4	26.3
Community and special interest groups	36.4	34.8	54.1	54.6	21.1
Basic education	7.7	9.1	32.4	54.6	15.8
Special events	26.5	21.2	18.9	48.9	47.4
Ethnic/cultural programs	8.2	16.7	21.6	22.8	5.3
Total Number of Respondents	196	77	37	141	19

schools offer such programs as well, but only 39% of Separate elementary English-language schools and 24% of French-language schools do so. Programs for youth groups such as Guides or 4H clubs are more common at the elementary level (47% to 64% for different types), while only one-third of secondary schools (both types) offer these. Special events, such as dances or movies, are much more likely to be happening at the secondary level. Over two-thirds of both types of secondary schools have such events, while only 44% of Public elementary schools and about 30% of Separate elementary schools do so. Summer programs for youth are offered in about half of Public elementary and secondary schools in the Public system, and in Separate elementary French-language schools, while they are found in only 30% of the other two types of Separate schools. Ethnic and cultural programs are found in about one-quarter of all types of schools with the exception of Public elementary schools where they are rare (9%).

The range of activities for adults shows some similarities to that for children. Again, athletics are most commonly found (70% to 90% in different types of schools). Interest clubs and courses are more common in Public schools (elementary - 54%, secondary - 80%) than in Separate ones (French language - 43%, English language and R.C./Pr. - about 27%). Community and special interest groups are most common in French-language schools and in secondary schools in the Public system (54%) and least so in R.C./Pr. ones (21%). Basic educational and academic courses are most often found in secondary schools in the Public system (55%) and in French-language schools (32%). They are least common in the other two types of elementary schools (about 8%). Special events, such as films, are more common at the secondary level (nearly one-half of both types offer these). About one-quarter of all types of elementary schools have such special events. Again, ethnic and cultural activities are less commonly found in these schools. About 20% of Separate French-language schools and secondary schools in the Public system have such programs. Cultural programs are least often found in R.C./Pr. schools (5%).

The questionnaire also sought information about the sponsorship of after-hours activities for youth and/or adults. Respondents were asked to describe who was mainly responsible for the on-going operation of these programs. In asking this question, principals were requested to choose one of three possible sources of responsibility: school staff, School Board staff, or some other organization. However, it appears that in many schools, this responsibility is shared between two or all three of these agencies. Tables 29 and 30 display the sponsorship of youth and adult activities respectively.

In most types of schools, activities for children and/or teens are more likely to be organized by agencies outside of the schools system, either independently of school or Board staff, or in conjunction with them, than to be organized by school and/or Board persons alone. It was noted that 80% of Public elementary schools and about 60% of most other school types reported that some other agency was involved in the organization of these programs. In R.C./Pr. schools, this trend was slightly reversed (60% school and/or Board responsibility only, 40% other agency involvement).

Adult activities are even less likely to be offered without the involvement of some agency outside of the school system. It was noted that 86% of Public elementary schools, 72% of Separate elementary English language schools and 60% of secondary schools in the Public system appear to have other agencies involved in these activities. For R.C./Pr. and French language elementary schools, school system staff alone are about equally likely to be responsible for adult programs as other agencies are to be involved.

Who are these other agencies? In descending order of frequency of involvement, the following sources of organization for activities were named by principals: for both youth and adult activities, by far the most common 'other' organizer is a municipal body such as Parks and Recreation. Next in line for youth activities are youth groups such as

TABLE 29: Who is Mainly Responsible for Youth Activities Offered After Hours in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
Who Responsible	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
School Staff &/or School Board	21.2	37.1	49.0	40.8	57.7
Other Agencies Alone or in Conjunction with School or Board	78.8	62.9	61.0	59.2	42.3
Total Number of Schools with Youth Activities	339	105	51	147	46

*Note: Non-response rate to this question was almost zero. About 16% of schools do not offer such activities.

TABLE 30: Who is Mainly Responsible for Adult Activities Offered in 5 Types of Schools

Who Responsible					
School Staff &/or School Board only	14.4	27.7	55.3	41.5	52.6
Other Agencies Alone or in Conjunction with School or Board	85.6	72.3	44.8	59.5	47.4
Total Number of Respondents with Adult Activities*	194	65	38	142	19

*Note: Non-response rate to this question was less than 1%. However, 44% of schools in sample had no activities for adults.

Cubs, Scouts, Brownies, Guides, 4H Clubs, and Junior Farmers. Parent groups such as P.T.A., Home and School or other Community School groups form the third most common "other" sponsoring agency for youth activities, and the second most common one for adult activities. Service clubs, church, and charity groups are mentioned about as often as are parent groups for youth activities. For adult activities, the third most common sources of sponsorship are community colleges and universities. Athletics and fitness clubs and cultural or artistic groups are mentioned next, with equal frequency for both types of activities. Next in order of frequency comes the Y.M.C.A. and a variety of unique other sources mentioned by a few other schools. Because of the small numbers involved and the lack of differences between school types, no table is given for "other" sponsoring agencies.

In summary, in only a minority of cases is the school system the main or only sponsoring agency for these extra activities. More commonly, other agencies working either alone, or in conjunction with school and/or Board of Education staff are responsible for sponsoring these extra-curricular or after-hours programs for children, youth, or adults.

In addition to these special activities for children and adults, a number of other types of community use of school facilities were explored. One question asked about the school library or resource centre's use by the community. Only a very small proportion of schools (between 2% and 14% for the five types) have their libraries open on a regular basis to the community.[6]

Another question asked for information about any special services, such as medical, dental, legal, or daycare, which may be provided at the school to the general public. Table 31 shows the types of special services offered in our schools. First of all, such services are

---

6. Because of the small numbers involved, no table has been attached for these figures.

offered in only a small proportion of schools. They are very rare at the secondary level (only 8% of those in the Public system, and none of those in the Separate/Private system offer such services). About 15% of English language and 30% of French language elementary schools have such services. The only type of service which is offered in significant porportions is of the medical or dental type. That is, if such a program is offered through a school, it is nearly always of this type. All other types of services, such as legal or daycare, are found in 5% or fewer schools of different types.

A related question asked about any recent involvement which the school may have had with neighbourhood improvement projects. Table 32 shows that such involvement is slightly more common than was the offering of special services. However, between two-thirds and four-fifths of all types of schools had had no involvement in neighbourhood improvement projects in the past two years. In those schools where there was some such involvement, it generally took the form of a beautification or cleanup project such as tree planting. These types of projects were more common in French-language schools than in the other types of schools (30% in contrast to 10%). Other types of community projects, such as helping the aged or the sick, raising funds, building playgrounds, or participating in other social action, seem to occur relatively infrequently (see Table 32).

(d) School-community Organizations

Yet another type of community-oriented activity concerns the establishment and maintenance or support of committees or organizations which have as their central purpose the improvement of communication between school and community. One section of the principal questionnaire explored the incidence and nature of this type of community involvement in our schools. We asked principals to describe the possible involvement of their school in community-related committees which operated at either the school level or at a more general one, such as a family of schools or an entire School Board.

TABLE 31: Special Services Offered at 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Special Services					
No services	82.7	88.8	68.1	91.8	100.0
Medical/Dental services	11.8	9.8	27.8	2.5	0.0
Other (legal, daycare, unspecif.)	5.5	3.4	4.1	5.7	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	399	143	72	158	49

TABLE 32: Recent Involvement in Neighbourhood Improvement Projects in 5 Types of Schools

Involvement					
No involvement	77.8	78.0	66.2	79.2	69.4
Beautification &/or Cleanup projects	10.3	12.8	29.7	7.8	12.2
All other projects (help aged, fund raising, etc.)	11.9	9.2	4.1	13.0	18.4
Total Number of Respondents	397	141	74	154	49

Table 33 shows the incidence of different types of school level community committees in these schools. Approximately 60% of schools of each type do not have any such committee in operation. Where there is a committee, it is most likely to be a P.T.A., Home and School Association, or other similar organization. These committees or organizations tend to involve parents only, and their function is mainly one of helping in relation to the school. Approximately 20% of most types of schools have such an organization. The exceptions are the secondary schools in the Public system, where 8% reported this type of organization.

The incidence of principals' advisory committees is somewhat lower, especially at the elementary level. Where advisory committees exist, they may have student, staff, and other representation in addition to parent and community members. Only 10% of both elementary English language schools (Public and Separate) have such advisory groups in operation. Very few French-language schools have such committees (4%). Approximately 16% of both types of secondary schools have advisory councils or committees. The factor the advisory councils all have in common is that they offer advice related to the school's program. These groups tend to provide one of the few formal channels whereby parents or community members may influence what happens in a school.

All other types of school-level community-school committees, discussion groups, organizers of volunteer programs and similar organizations are grouped together in Table 33. Individually, they were too rare to allow generalizations. Combined, we can see that a small proportion (2% to 18%) of schools of all types do have some of these various kinds of groups in operation.

Principals were also asked to rate the effectiveness, as mechanisms of communication, of their school-community committees. Table 34 displays their answers to this question. The majority of all groups of principals having school-community committees judged them to be effective. Most likely to feel that their committees were effective were the R.C./Pr.

TABLE 33: School Level Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Committees					
None	60.0	57.3	58.1	67.3	59.2
P.T.A. or similar parent committee	22.3	18.2	20.0	8.3	22.4
Principal's advisory committee	10.1	11.2	3.8	16.0	16.3
Other types of committees	7.6	13.3	18.1	8.3	2.1
Total Number of Respondents	395	143	74	156	49

TABLE 34: Effectiveness of School Level Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools

Effectiveness					
Very or somewhat effective	79.8	66.1	90.0	70.0	100.00
Slightly effective or not at all effective	20.2	33.9	10.0	30.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	159	59	30	50	20

school principals. All of these principals (100%) stated that the committee was either "very" or at least "somewhat" effective. The Separate elementary French-language school principals also gave high success rates to their committees (90%). Public elementary school principals were next (80%). The two groups with the lowest effectiveness ratings were the principals of Separate elementary English-language schools and those in secondary schools in the Public system. Even here, only one-third of respondents judged the committees to be "slightly" or "not at all" effective. On the whole, where there are committees, principals seem to feel that they do work; there do not appear to be any great differences between school types with respect to this variable.*

Principals made varied comments about the difficulties that their committees were experiencing. Lack of representation of the whole community, apathy, and too great a reliance on the principals were some of the more commonly mentioned barriers to the greater effectiveness of these school-community groups. A number of principals mentioned, as well, that their groups were improving or "growing" with time. Some typical principal comments about school-community committees were:

> School community groups can be an effective educational instrument. However, since their role is defined neither by law nor by the school board, their effectiveness is basically a function of the personalities of the committee members involved. This aspect can, unfortunately, result in personality conflicts, intimidation and negative educational policies at the school level - and all of this is given the tacit sanction of a school-community committee. It would be unlikely to have these negative effects if all eligible community members would take an active interest. However, most committees seem to be monopolized either by the "concerned" few or by the "outspoken" few.
>
> Handled wisely, such committees can be very productive in developing a philosophy for the school which is larger than the personality of the principal. Consistency of approach should not be subject to personnel changes.

* The reader should keep in mind that the majority of schools do not have committees.

> Perhaps the greatest value of these committees is that the participation by the public enables them to see at first hand what the funding restrictions are in the case of many possible programs. They see the actual realities which must be faced, and learn to appreciate the difficulties which have to be overcome in order to establish successful programs.

> We have used such a committee in the past to get input into policy formulation where there had to be a high degree of parent involvement in order to communicate objectives, explore the problem areas, assist with the communication and to assist with the implementation and acceptance of new policy.
>
> The committee was very successful and allowed us to implement many changes. However, when the major changes were completed and we moved into a period of consolidation, the committee tired of maintenance-type work and dissolved.
>
> I believe that committees of this sort should be raised when needed and dissolved when their work is completed.

> The problem is that they turn to me for leadership when they should be doing the leading and I, the following. When I withdraw, it collapses.

> This would certainly be an interesting concept, particularly if the school were directed by such a committee, independent of a School Board. The principal would answer only to a board of directors, composed of interested parents in the immediate area. In this way, the school would and could react to the community's needs.

We asked principals to indicate, as well, the participation of their schools in broader-level community-related committees. These more general level committees might be operating at the Board level or at the level of a group of schools Table 35 displays the frequency of participation in such committees for different types of schools. The majority of schools of all types are not represented on such committees. Only about 20% of English-language elementary schools (both types) and about 33% of secondary schools (both types) have some such participation. Separate elementary French-language schools are most likely to participate (44%). Basically, about the same proportion of schools are represented on broader-level (Board/Family of schools) community

TABLE 35: School Representation on Board/Family of Schools Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr (%)
Representation					
Yes	22.6	21.0	43.7	32.3	36.2
No	77.4	79.0	56.3	67.7	63.8
Total Number of Respondents	389	138	71	155	47

TABLE 36: Parent/Community Participation ("A Great Deal" or "Somewhat") in Kinds of Decisions in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr (%)
Participation					
Curriculum decisions	26.3	27.7	30.7	21.7	24.5
Rules/regulations decisions	42.7	45.0	44.0	31.8	59.2
Philosophy decisions	42.9	48.9	45.3	39.5	75.5
Total Number of Respondents	396	141	75	157	49

committees as have their own school-level committees. The exceptions are the English-language elementary schools which are somewhat more likely to have just school-level community committees (see Tables 33 and 35).

(e) Community Participation in Decision-Making

The last area of community-school relationships explored in the principal questionnaire concerned the question of community participation in the school's decision-making processes. We attempted to find out the degree to which such participation was happening.

One series of questions asked principals to indicate the degree to which parents and community members usually shared in three types of decisions made at school. The three types of decisions concerned school curriculum, rules and practices, and philosophy. Table 34 displays the results of these questions. Principals had been asked to rate degrees of participation along a four point scale ("a great deal," "somewhat," "very little," and "not at all"). The first two of these points ("a great deal" and "somewhat") have been combined to form the percentages which appear in Table 36, indicating the degree to which there is at least some involvement of the community in the types of decisions made.

Approximately one-quarter of all five types of schools appear to involve parents and community in curriculum decisions. The differences between school types with respect to this variable are almost non-existent. Just under half of all three types of elementary schools appear to involve parents and community in decisions regarding both school rules and regulations and school philosophy. Secondary schools in the Public system are less likely to involve parents here (only one-third do so), while R.C./Pr. schools are more likely to do so (60% involve parents in rules/regulations decisions, while 75% do so for philosophy decisions).

The mechanisms whereby this participation takes place were not explored in detail. Presumably they involve a combination of formal and informal channels of communications. We have seen above (Table 33) that very few schools (15% or less) have school level committees, with specifically advisory functions. The degree to which the various types of parent and community committees have informal advisory functions (e.g. have a sounding board function) is uncertain. A particular amount of community influence is clearly exerted through such channels as the School Board, while more direct influence may be exercised in informal exchanges between school staff and parents or community members Nonetheless, in the judgment of the principals, parents and community members had considerable influence in the making of at least some types of school decisions.

One of the open-ended items on the principals' questionnaire explored a related aspect of community participation. The question addressed the concern of some educators that greater involvement of the community in the school might lead to a demand by the community to assume greater control. Principals were asked to state their own experiences with and feelings about this matter. Table 37 displays the principals' replies to this question.

Only 3% or fewer principals in any of the school types commented that anything resembling community control had ever taken place in their personal experience or in the recent history of their current schools. These principals tended to have strong feelings opposing such community control:

> I entirely agree - based on my previous experience in other schools, this indeed was the intent of the community - and it had a total disruptive factor on the teaching and learning environment within the school.
>
> I have seen this happen and it can interfere with the security and confidence that a staff feels towards their jobs.
>
> This has happened in the past at our school. Now the parents are kept in check by explaining their specific role.

TABLE 37: Principals' Comments About Community Involvement Leading to Community Control in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Comments					
Some control experienced in school/ by principal	2.5(9)*	0.9(1)	3.1(2)	0.7(1)	0.0(0)
Some control has happened elsewhere	28.8(103)	47.9(56)	10.8(7)	39.5(58)	29.3(12)
Control may happen under certain conditions	30.7(110)	31.6(37)	18.5(12)	30.6(45)	36.6(15)
Control may happen in some aspects of school's operation	5.6(20)	7.7(9)	6.2(4)	1.4(2)	7.3(3)
Not concerned about control/can't happen	47.8(171)	37.6(44)	29.2(19)	44.2(65)	43.9(18)
Welcome involvement of community	14.2(51)	29.9(35)	32.3(21)	11.6(17)	9.8(4)
Cooperative community, no desire to control	5.9(21)	3.4(4)	7.7(5)	3.4(5)	2.4(1)
Apathetic community, no interest in control	6.7(24)	7.7(9)	1.5(1)	4.1(6)	2.4(1)
Total Number of Respondents	358	117	65	147	41

* Numbers in brackets denote number of responses

Note: Percentages do not add up to 100% as one or two comments could be coded for each respondent. While 12% of the total sample did not respond to this question, nearly one-half of those who did, made two or more comments (only the first two were coded).

Much more common was the comment that control was a distinct possibility and that they had heard of related activities happening elsewhere, in other schools. Nearly one-half of Separate elementary English-language school principals made this comment, as did about 40% of those in secondary schools in the Public system, and about 30% of those in Public elementary, and R.C./Pr. schools. Only 10% of French language principals answered this question in this way. Some typical comments in this category are as follows:

> I agree! I don't want parents running the school. When that happens, I'll go into some other line of work!!!
>
> I have heard of this concern, but I have not experienced it yet. I would not want the community to assume greater control than what exists now.
>
> It is a danger to be guarded against.

Another common remark of a similar type warned that community control could easily evolve under certain conditions. Approximately 30% of the principals in most groups (only 19% of French language ones) warned that only a strong principal, well defined roles, or firm guidelines would prevent the community from achieving undue power. Some typical comments included:

> I agree unless the ground rules are clearly delineated and supported by the Board.
>
> If guidelines and limitations are established at the beginning of such an endeavour, this type of potential problem could be avoided.
>
> If, as a principal, I have my plans outlined and know where I am going and what kind of help I want from the community, this shouldn't happen. If, however, I go blindly into this venture without a plan, it could well happen.
>
> To some extent this can be true. One has to take a firm attitude about those areas in which the community should not be involved.

Another related comment concerned the restriction of areas of community involvement to exclude their "interference" in certain areas only. Very few principals (less than 8% in any school type) made this type of comment. Typical remarks are:

> The community should assume a greater control of extra-curricular activities, but not control of curriculum.
>
> I have a parent group, but I would not want them too involved in the decision-making, as far as educational priorities, etc.
>
> The community should have input and expect information regarding types of programmes going on in the school, but not control of the curriculum or programmes.

A large group of principals (30% in French language schools, about 40% of all other types) simply stated that they had no concerns or fears regarding possible community control. They felt that community control of their school was an unlikely event and one from which they felt very little threat. This was, in fact, the most common reply to the question:

> I feel that parents in this community are not concerned about control, but instead want a better knowledge of what exists within our schools.
>
> Do not feel any threat. Welcome community involvement.
>
> This does not worry me. If people make reasonable proposals which can help the situation, all to the good. I must trust to my own powers of persuasion; otherwise I should not occupy the position which I have.
>
> The aspect has never been a concern here.

A relatively small number of principals suggested that community control would not evolve because their own community had a basically cooperative and helpful attitude toward the school (2% to 8% made this comment), or alternatively because people were too busy or uninterested in school (2% to 8% made this comment). Some typical remarks in these categories were:

> Our problem seems to be to find an incentive to alert the community to becoming involved.
>
> The community here is somewhat apathetic. There is more need to involve the community in the role as educator of children.
>
> I am not in the least concerned. It is very difficult to involve large numbers of parents in this community in anything.
>
> I feel the persons in our area who use our school facilities or become involved in the school are just grateful to be able to participate or to enjoy the facilities. I do not fear demands by these people to assume greater control.
>
> In this community there would be no problem. The parents are for the most part uneducated and have great faith in educators.
>
> This community has a desire to help but not to direct.

On the whole, while many principals do have concerns about the possible implications of community involvement, their concerns appear to be based on preconceptions and rumour, rather than on past personal experiences with communities attempting to assert their power. While many principals said they heard about such events, very few reported having experienced one. Nevertheless, a number of principals do feel that specific policies must be formulated to circumvent possible control by the community of at least some areas of school operation. On the other hand, many principals state that they either do not believe community control could happen in their schools, or that they would welcome more community involvement. At any rate, actual problems with communities attempting to gain more power than school authorities wish them to have appear to have been very rare in Ontario to this date.

The results of one last question in the questionnaire should be described before closing this section about community and school relationships in Ontario. Principals were asked the following question: "In your opinion, do members of the community seem interested in what goes on at this school?" Their responses are shown in Table 38. Principals do see their communities as being quite interested in their school. About one-quarter or slightly more of principals in each of the 5 types of schools said the communities were interested "to a great extent" while about one-half of all groups said "a moderate amount". Practically no-one said that the community was "not at all" interested. There are no differences between school types with respect to this variable.

(f) Summary of Findings Presented in Section 2

This section presented findings about the nature and extent of a variety of community-involving or community related aspects of programs in five types of Ontario schools. Main findings for each of these types of schools are summarized below:

Public Elementary Schools

Nearly all of these schools had sent five or more newsletters to their pupils' homes in the current year. Principals in these schools talked often with parents (80% did so on an average of once a day or more often). All schools had staged one or more public concerts or plays during the school year (half had done so three or more times). About half of these schools made use of the public media on an occasional or regular basis.

Nearly all schools of this type emphasized community concerns in at least some of their classes. Frequent field trips to the local community were made by over half of these schools and almost all schools made such trips at least occasionally. Only 5% of these schools offered courses which involved students working outside of the school for at least part of the time. About three-quarters of these schools made use of visiting speakers in their classes either "frequently" or "sometimes." Parent and/or community volunteers were used, on a regular basis as well as on an occasional basis, by most of these schools.

The great majority of these schools offered or provided facilities for

TABLE 38: Principals' Estimates of Level of Community Interest in 5 Types of Schools.

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Interest Level					
A great extent	27.1	25.4	28.0	26.3	31.1
A moderate amount	55.6	49.3	49.3	53.2	55.6
A little	16.8	23.9	22.7	19.9	13.3
Not at all	0.5	1.4	0.0	0.6	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	395	142	75	157	47

86

after-hours activities for children. About half of the schools offered similar activities for adults. Special services, such as medical, dental, or legal services were offered through about 15% of these schools. About one-quarter of these schools had recently participated in some neighbourhood improvement projects.

About 40% of these schools had some type of community-related committee operating at the level of the school. About one-quarter of the schools participated in some similar committee which operated at a more general level than the school itself.

According to the principals, about one-quarter of these schools had some degree of parental/community participation in decisions affecting the school's curriculum. Nearly half of the schools were said to involve parents/community in decisions affecting school rules and regulations and school philosophy.

While almost no principals in these schools reported having been in a school when there had been attempts by community members to control aspects of the school's operation, about one-third of these principals felt that such a possibility existed. About half of the principals stated, however, that this was not a source of concern, and about 15% commented that they would welcome increased community involvement, irrespective of "control" implications.

Secondary Schools in the Public System

About three-quarters of these schools sent three or more newsletters to parents during the school year in which the research was conducted. Principals in about two-thirds of these schools talked with parents at least once each day or more often. These schools held many public concerts, plays and other performances - three-quarters held three or more such events each year. The great majority of these schools made regular use of the public media in order to provide information about the school.

Half of these schools reported that a community orientation in their curriculum was their school policy, while nearly all others said that such an orientation existed in at least some of their classes. Students in the majority of these schools made frequent field trips to their local communities. About two-thirds of the schools offered courses which required students to work outside of the school for at least part of the time. Visiting speakers were frequently invited to the majority of these schools. However, only about one-third of these schools used parent or community volunteers on a regular basis.

In nearly all of these schools (over 90%) there were after-hours programs for youth as well as for adults. Special services, such as medical or legal services, were offered through 8% of these schools. About one-fifth of the schools were reported to have participated in some type of neighbourhood improvement project within the past two years.

School level community-oriented committees were in operation in one-third of these schools. One-third of the schools, as well, participated in similar committees operating at a more general level.

Principals in one-fifth of these schools reported that parents or community members were participating in the making of curriculum-related decisions. The same was true in about one-third of these schools for both decisions affecting school rules and regulations and those affecting school philosophy. While very few principals in these schools had experienced any attempts at community control, about one-third felt that this could happen. Nearly half of these principals, however, stated that this was not a source of concern to them, while some said that they welcomed increased involvement by the community.

Separate Elementary Schools (English-language)

Nearly all of these schools had sent five or more newsletters to their pupils' homes during the current year. Principals in 80% of these schools reported that they talked with parents at least once each day. Almost all schools held at least one public play or concert each year, and about one-third held three or more such events. While about one-fifth of these schools never made use of the public media, about half did so regularly.

Community issues were part of the curriculum of at least some classes in nearly all of these schools, and such an orientation was a school-wide policy in about one-third of them. Field trips to the local community were regularly made by the great majority of these schools. About 10% of the schools had some courses with an out-of-school component. The use of visiting speakers was a regular event in about half of these schools. About two-thirds of the schools used parent or community volunteers on a regular basis, and 80% did so on an occasional basis.

After-hours activities for children were held in three-quarters of these schools, and similar activities for adults were offered through 45% of the schools. Special services such as legal or medical help were offered through 10% of these schools. About one-quarter of the schools reported that they had recently participated in some neighbourhood improvement project.

School level community-related committees were operating in nearly half of those schools. About one-fifth of the schools participated in some more general level community committee.

About one-third of the schools had some parent or community participation in decisions affecting school curriculum. About half of the schools had similar participation for decisions affecting both rules and regulations and philosophy. While almost no principals in these school reported having experienced any attempts at control from the community, about 40% stated that this could be a possibility. However, a similar proportion (40%) said they were not concerned about this and another one-third emphasized that greater degrees of community involvement were to be desired, at any rate.

Separate Elementary Schools (French-language)

The great majority of these schools had sent five or more newsletters to their pupils' homes during the current year. Most of the principals in these schools indicated that they talked with parents at least once each day. Most of the schools had staged some type of public play or concert during the year and about one-third had done so more than once. Nearly 30% of the schools made no use of public media and another 40% did so only seldom. Only 5% of these schools used such media often.

The great majority of these schools had some reflection of local community issues in their curriculum - at least in some classes. Most schools made some field trips to the local community, but only one-quarter did so frequently. About 10% of the schools offered courses with an out-of-school component. Most schools used occasional visiting speakers and one-quarter did so frequently. About 40% of the schools used parent volunteers on a regular basis while about 60% used them occasionally.

About 70% of the schools have after-hours activities for youth and about half had similar activities for adults. Special services, such as legal or medical care, were offered in nearly one-third of these schools. One-third of these schools had participated in neighbourhood improvement projects within the past two years.

School level community-related committees were operating in about 40% of the schools and slightly more (44%) were represented on similar committees operating at a more general level.

In 30% of the schools, parents were involved in the making of curriculum-related decisions. In 45% of the schools, parents were involved in decisions affecting school rules and regulations, and school philosophy. Very few principals in these schools reported experiences with community control attempts, but about 25% stated that this could happen under certain conditions. However, 30% said that this was not a cause for concern and another 30% stated that they would welcome increased levels of community involvement.

R.C./Pr. Schools

Most of these schools had sent one or more newsletters to their students' homes during the school year. Most principals in these schools talked with parents once a day or more often. All schools had staged some plays or concerts during the school year and half of them had staged four or more such performances. Nearly all schools made some use of public media in order to provide information about the school. About one-third of the schools used these media "often," while one-third used them "sometimes" and another one-third, "seldom."

Nearly all schools emphasized local community concerns in at least some of their classes and such an emphasis was a school-wide policy in almost half of these schools. Students in most of these schools tended to go on field trips to the local community on a regular basis. About one-quarter of these schools offered courses with an out-of-school component. Visiting speakers appeared frequently in about half of these schools and occasionally in the remainder. Parent and community volunteers worked on a regular basis in about 40% of the schools, while nearly all of the schools used such volunteers occasionally.

After-hours activities for youth were offered through nearly all of these schools and in about 40% of such schools, activities for adults were offered as well. In none of these schools was there any provision for such special services as daycare or legal help. About one-third of these schools had participated in some type of neighbourhood improvement project in the past two-year period.

School level community-related committees were operating in about 40% of the schools, while one-third of them were represented on committees with similar functions but operating at a more general level than the school itself.

About one-quarter of the schools reported that the community participated in decisions affecting school curriculum. Participation in decisions affecting school rules and regulations was much more frequent (60%), while three-quarters of the schools had parent/community participation in the setting of school philosophy. None of the principals in these schools had experienced attempts by the community to control some aspects of the school's operation. However, nearly half of the principals stated that such control could take place under some conditions. In response to the same question regarding community control, close to half of the principals commented that this was not a source of concern to them, while about 10% said that increased community involvement would be welcomed regardless of implications for control.

Section 3

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN ONTARIO SCHOOLS

In this section we will look at the way that the principals in our survey carry out their role. We will note how they respond to the requirements of their position within the school itself and in relation to the school's community. In parts (a) through (d) we will describe the principal's roles in the school as a whole and some of his overall problems in relation to this. In parts (e) through (h) we will describe the principal's role in and attitudes toward various aspects of community relations. A summary of findings from this section will be provided in part (i).

(a) Principals' Time-Allocation for Various Tasks - Actual and Ideal

One question on the principals' questionnaire asked principals to indicate the degree of time ("a great deal," "quite a bit," "moderate amount," or "relatively little") which they spent on each of eight types of activities associated with their role as principals of their schools. We will look at the proportion of principals who indicated that they spent considerable time (i.e. "a great deal" or "quite a bit") on each of these activities. These percentages appear in Table 39.

The majority of principals say they spend a lot of time on administrative tasks. In slightly over one-half of public and separate English language elementary schools, the principal spends "a great deal" or "quite a bit" of time on administrative activities. An even larger proportion of the other three types of school principals spend a lot of time in this way (approximately 70% for French language elementary and for both types of schools offering secondary school programs).

About half of all groups of principals indicate they spend much time on such curriculum-related tasks as planning and evaluation (between 45% and 60% for all 5 types of schools).

TABLE 39: Principals Spending "A Great Deal" or "Quite A Bit" of Time on Each of 8 Types of Activities in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Types of Activities					
Administrative Tasks	52.0	54.9	77.3	67.0	73.5
Curriculum Tasks	44.5	49.3	60.3	48.1	59.0
Supervision of Support Staff	26.3	34.1	26.8	20.6	16.3
Supervision of Teachers	41.9	42.5	56.9	67.6	46.5
Classroom Teaching	23.9	35.7	20.0	3.3	6.5
Student-Related Tasks	31.5	25.6	22.7	31.4	41.7
Professional Activities	16.2	18.9	33.3	24.1	14.3
Community-Related Tasks	21.3	14.7	40.0	6.3	16.3

Note: Total number of respondents varies between activities and cannot be given for table as a whole. Non-response rates for different activities are always less than 10%.

Approximately one-half of most principals say they spend a considerable amount of time on the supervision and evaluation of their teaching staff. Somewhat more principals in secondary schools in the Public system (68%) spend a lot of their time in this way.

About 30% of elementary and 20% of secondary school principals say that they spend much time on the supervision of their support staffs.

While very few secondary school principals spend much time on classroom teaching (about 5% do), 35% of principals in Separate elementary English-language schools, and 20% of those in the other two types of elementary schools, do so.

Only about 25% of school principals (most types) say they spend a lot of time on student-related activities, other than classroom teaching. Somewhat more R.C./Pr. school principals say they spend much time in this way (42%).

Out-of-school professional activities also claim a lot of the principals' time. One-third of those principals who are in French-language schools indicate they spend much time on such activities as attending Board meetings or conferences, as do one-quarter of secondary school principals in the Public system, and about 15% of the principals in the three remaining types of schools.

A greater proportion of principals of French-language schools say they spend much time on community-related activities (e.g. talking with parents or organizing volunteers) than do principals in other types of schools. About 40% of French-language school principals indicate this, while only about 20% or fewer principals in other types of schools do so.

Overall, there are few differences in how principals of different types of schools allocate their time among their different tasks. The overall proportion of principals spending a lot of time on the different activities is as follows: administrative tasks (60%); curriculum tasks and staff supervision (50% for each); student-related tasks (30%); supervision of support staff (25%); classroom teaching and professional activities (20% each) and community-related activities (15%). Of course, all principals spend at least a small amount of time on each of these types of activities.

Principals were also asked to indicate the amounts of time they would ideally like to spend on each of these types of activities (see Table 40).

The proportion of principals who would like, ideally, to spend a considerable amount of time on administrative tasks contrasts sharply with the proportion who presently do so. Only between 7% and 19% of principals of different types of schools said they would like to spend much time on these tasks, whereas an average of 60% now do so (see Table 39).

Most principals say they would like to spend a lot of their time on curriculum-related tasks (three-quarters or more do). Again, this is different from the present situation where only about 50% now do so (see Table 39).

More principals would also like to spend much time on the supervision of support staff than now do (about 50% ideally; 25% actually).

The difference in the principals' actual and ideal amounts of time spent on the supervision of teaching staff is even more dramatic. Among all groups of principals, a greater proportion indicate they would like to spend a considerable time in this way than said they currently did so. At least 20% more principals in each group would like to do this, but the difference is greatest for R.C./Pr school principals (47 actually; 68% ideally).

TABLE 40: Principals Who Would Like, Ideally, To Spend "A Great Deal" or "Quite A Bit" of Time on Each of 8 Types of Activities in 5 Types of Schools

Types of Activities	Elementary Public (%)	Elementary Separate English (%)	Elementary Separate French (%)	Secondary Public (%)	Secondary R.C./Pr. (%)
Administrative Tasks	7.4	7.1	18.9	16.7	15.2
Curriculum Tasks	76.2	83.6	93.3	77.9	80.9
Supervision of Support Staff	47.4	55.5	50.0	38.0	47.8
Supervision of Teachers	65.3	72.5	82.6	84.8	87.8
Classroom Teaching	24.8	28.6	31.4	2.2	8.7
Student-Related Tasks	51.0	48.9	48.0	61.2	67.7
Professional Activities	11.1	10.7	28.0	12.7	6.4
Community-Related Activities	31.0	23.6	54.1	26.0	22.0

Note: Total number of respondents varies between activities and cannot be given for table as a whole. Non response rates for different activities are always less than 10%.

There is very little difference in the proportions of principals spending and wanting to spend a lot of time on classroom teaching.

Greater proportions of all groups of principals, on the other hand, would prefer to spend much time on student-related activities than currently do. About one-half of elementary school principals (all types) and about two-thirds of secondary school principals (both types) indicate a desire to spend a considerable amount of time on student-related activities. In contrast, about 20% fewer elementary school principals and 30% fewer secondary school principals say that they now are spending "a great deal" or "quite a bit" of time on student-related tasks (see Table 39).

All groups of principals, it seems, would prefer to see a decrease in the amount of time spent on professional activities. However, this decrease is slight (10% or less for each school type).

Finally, approximately 10% more principals in each group would like to have a lot of time for community-related activities than do currently. The largest difference is for secondary schools in the Public system, where there is a 20% increase in the number of principals who would like to spend much time on these types of activities.

In summary, relative to their current situation, proportionately more principals would prefer to spend much time on curriculum tasks, staff supervision, student-related tasks, and community-related activities. Very few principals would prefer to spend much time on administrative tasks and for professional activities. Actual and ideal amounts of time spent on classroom teaching do not differ significantly.

(b) Who Could Assist With Aspects of the Principal's Job?

In conjunction with the above questions, principals were also asked to describe the person or group of persons who they felt could effectively assume those aspects of their current role at which they would prefer to spend less time. Table 41 displays the principals' answers to this question. Slightly over one-half of our sample did not respond to this item on the questionnaire, perhaps because they could not see any one individual assisting with their many tasks. (The duties of principals are detailed in Regulation 191, Section 14 (1-9), Appendix B.) Of those who did, about one-third mentioned more than one item. The first two mentioned persons or groups were coded for these respondents. The table presents a summation of first and second responses. Because of these restrictions, percentages in this table may be somewhat misleading in that they may exaggerate small differences between the groups.

The two main types of persons that principals suggested might take over parts of their current role were vice-principals and secretaries. Approximately one-half of all principals suggested the vice-principal (the range was 39% to 59% for the 5 groups) as being most qualified to assume parts of the principal's job. About as many principals of elementary schools (all types), suggest the secretary. However, only about 15% of secondary school principals did so. The latter were much more likely to mention the administrative assistant as a suitable person (22% of Public system and 42% of R.C./Pr. school principals did so). Practically no elementary school principals made this suggestion.

Since we have seen above that the least desired task of the principals, and the one at which he/she currently spends most time, is administrative work, it is understandable that vice-principals, secretaries, and administrative assistants were by far the most common choices in answer to this question. After all, these people have, traditionally, dealt with administrative detail. Typical principal comments in this area were:

> A full-time secretary would free me from - answering phones - marking tests (standardized) - collecting milk and lunch money and keeping books - putting on band-aids.

TABLE 41: Principals' Suggestions For Who Might Assume Less Desired Parts of Their Roles - In 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
Principals' Suggestions	Public (5)(#)	Separate English (%)(#)	Separate French (%)(#)	Public (%)(#)	R.C./Pr. (%)(#)
Vice-Principal	42.3(93)	38.8(33)	50.0(10)	59.3(54)	41.9(13)
Secretary	49.6(109)	56.4(48)	35.0(7)	15.4(14)	16.1(5)
Administrative Assistant	6.8(15)	5.9(5)	0.0(0)	22.0(20)	41.9(13)
Teacher	18.6(41)	18.8(16)	5.0(1)	29.7(27)	16.1(5)
Guidance/Social Agency	4.5(10)	1.2(1)	0.0(0)	3.3(3)	9.7(3)
Parent Volunteers	6.4(14)	10.6(9)	10.0(2)	0.0(0)	6.5(2)
Co-ordinators/ Specialists	4.5(10)	8.2(7)	10.0(2)	6.6(6)	0.0(0)
Total Number of Respondents*	220	85	20	91	31

* 54% of principals did not answer this question. Of those that did, one-third mentioned two or more persons and the first two of these were coded. Because of the small numbers of principals responding, numbers, as well as percentages are given in this table.

> Much of the work formerly done by the local "Inspector" and more recently by the Area Superintendents has been delegated to the principals. More departments in the larger units of administration produce more requests for reports, etc. A business administrator in the schools would free the principal for administration of the more academic work in the school.

> Vice-principal - acceptance by the Board that the V.P.'s position is a training stage and requires administrative time, free of classes. Division Chairmen or Chairwomen - to co-ordinate curriculum-related tasks at a specific level - evaluate and recommend texts, materials and equipment for levels concerned - outline budget request priorities from each division (similar to Department Heads at the Secondary level).

> I feel that a well-qualified administrative secretary could handle most of these duties providing that this person had some time on the job to learn the basic duties. However, I do not feel that the Board of Education will ever pay these people enough so that the properly trained or qualified applicants will apply for the job.

> Re: many "administrative" tasks: the only solution I see to the growing bureaucratic demands on the time of the principal is the presence of an administrative assistant in the school (not a teacher necessarily, and not likely a teacher) who could be trained to organize, structure, plan, complete, etc. all the reports, surveys, and the like, that require putting together considerable materials and resources; and additionally could handle many tasks that require neither "teacher" nor "secretarial" skills, but personality skills and organizational ability.

The only other category of persons mentioned with some frequency was that of teachers or department heads. Approximately 20% of all respondents made this suggestion. All other types of persons or groups were mentioned by 10% or less of any group of principals. Those persons included guidance staff, social agencies, parent volunteers, co-ordinators and specialists. On the whole, however, most principals appeared to have some difficulty with suggesting possible alternatives for freeing their time for more preferred tasks:

> I really cannot see how anyone else could do the things I would rather not do, e.g. spend long hours listening to parent problems (which I would rather not do), but I feel I must do it if I consider myself leader of our school community, a sort of "family" group, parents teachers, children.

> Nobody's crazy enough!

> Not really. That's the problem.

Another comment made by many principals in response to this question concerned the wish for a reduction in the amount of paperwork generated by the Board of Education or the Ministry. Rather than suggesting someone to take over this aspect of their job, the principals would like their Boards and the Ministry to reduce their requests for reports and memos:

> Trustees reacting to public minority groups generate a great deal of research work, meetings, etc. If a principal was not subjected to Trustee reactions, but allowed the autonomy to run his school and be accountable to the community he serves, this would help a great deal.

> The paperwork and required follow-up seems to require a great deal of time, much of it requiring personal involvement to see it through. Board bulletins, regional memos and requests from other various departments demand more and more of the principal's time. The cause, they say, is shortage of help, or they want the principals to be aware of what is going on. Give them more help and eliminate these tasks from the principal.

> Administrators could do away with most of their damned memos, reports, etc. and leave us free to do our jobs properly.

(c) Constraining Factors on the Principalship

Principals were asked about some basic constraining factors in their roles, as well as about those forces which they felt created the greatest problems they had to face.

The first of these questions was stated as follows: "In carrying out your role as principal, to what extent do you feel that you are constrained by the following factors or groups?" Thirteen possible sources of constraint were listed and respondents were asked to state the degree to which they did, in fact, find each one of these constraining. A four point scale ("a great deal," "somewhat," "very little," "not at all") was provided for the principals' answers. In Table 42, the first two of these choices ("a great deal" and "somewhat") have been combined to indicate percentages of principals, in each of the five types of schools, who found each of the factors constraining, at least "somewhat" or more.

The item of "time limitations" was named as a constraining factor by nearly all (over 80% in each category) principals. This was the item with the highest "constraint" rating in the list. Almost as many principals (approximately 80% in each category) called "budget limitations" constraining. The limitations of "school space and equipment" were next. About 55% of most groups of principals found these constraining. A considerably greater proportion of R.C./Pr. school principals found their schools constraining in this way (84%).

"Formal administrative procedures" or what some might call "red tape" were other commonly named sources of constraint on principals. Approximately 55% of most groups (and 74% of these in French-language schools) stated that they found these to be constraining factors.

Boards of Education and the Ministry of Education were also found to place constraints on the principals, although to a lesser degree than the above factors.

TABLE 42: Factors Which Principals Find Constraining ("A Great Deal" or "Somewhat") In Carrying Out Their Roles in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
Factors	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Time Limitations	83.8	88.2	96.0	82.0	89.4
Budget Limitations	77.0	73.8	83.8	76.6	85.5
Conflicts with Support Staff	8.9	18.3	18.7	13.6	19.1
Teaching Staff	18.0	26.9	20.8	25.1	34.1
Board of Education Administration	34.0	35.2	58.1	45.6	29.8
Trustees	26.3	31.8	43.1	35.7	33.4
Formal Administrative Procedures	50.6	55.0	73.3	51.6	62.5
Community/Parents	11.1	18.2	25.7	8.2	10.4
School Space/ Equipment	54.5	63.0	61.3	54.4	83.6
Students	16.5	14.0	27.0	17.1	23.4
Teacher Federations	11.1	7.7	12.0	53.8	15.2
Support Staff Unions	6.7	4.9	20.0	27.8	13.1
Ministry of Education	21.2	22.7	18.7	38.0	47.8

Total Number of Respondents - As the total number of respondents varies slightly from item to item in this table, it cannot be given for the table as a whole. In no case is the non-response rate over 10%.

Of the Board of Education, the Administration was slightly more likely to be named a constraint than were the trustees. About one-third of English language elementary schools and R.C./Pr. schools named Board Administration as a source of constraint. Secondary school principals in the Public system and French language principals were even more likely to answer like this (45% and 58% respectively). Board trustees were identified as constraining factors by about one-third of all groups of principals.

The Ministry of Education was said to be a source of constraint by about 20% of elementary school principals (all types) and by about 40% of secondary school principals (in all types of systems).

Other factors mentioned in the question could be said to be constraining for only a small minority of principals. These factors are: conflicts with teaching staff (about 25% overall); teacher federations (54% for secondary school principals in the Public system,[1] about 12% for others); conflicts with support staff (about 15% overall); support staff unions (28% for secondary school principals in the Public system, 20% for French language school principals, 10% average for others); students (about 20% overall); and community and parents (25% for French-language school principals, about 10% for others).

(d) Greatest Problems of Principalship

One of the major open-ended items on the questionnaire asked principals to describe what, from their own experience, they felt to be the greatest problem facing the principalship. While 10% of principals did no answer this question, many of those who did so went on to describe two, three, or even more of the "greatest" problems. Up to five items were coded for each respondent. Table 43 displays the percentages of

---

[1] One possible explanation for the large proportion of secondary school principals in this category may lie in the Public secondary school teacher strikes which were occurring in several centres at this time. Provincial legislation forbade principal participation in these strikes. It should be pointed out that principals and teachers are members of the same federation.

TABLE 43: Principals' Judgments About "The Greatest Problem Facing the Principalship Today" in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
Greatest Problems	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Lack of Resources	32.6	30.4	21.5	25.9	31.7
Staff Conflict	23.5	23.2	21.5	41.5	31.7
Conflict of Expectations	25.7	35.2	28.4	24.5	43.9
Increasing Demands	26.0	32.0	22.4	12.9	7.3
Rapid Change	16.9	17.6	19.4	17.7	22.0
Big Business Nature of Education	8.3	8.0	6.0	13.6	19.5
Not Enough Guidance	13.3	26.4	10.4	10.2	9.8
Lack of Autonomy	20.4	18.4	13.4	34.0	19.5
Keeping up Morale	18.5	12.8	14.9	22.4	24.4
Declining Morality	11.3	8.8	20.9	10.2	7.3
Public Relations	16.5	15.2	13.4	17.0	2.4
Total Number of Respondents	362	125	65	147	41

Note: 10% of respondents did not answer this question.

principals, in each type of school, who mentioned each particular type of problem in eleven categories.

Lack of basic resources, such as time, money, or help, was one of the most commonly mentioned problem areas. Approximately 30% of principals, in all five types of schools, stated that having inadequate resources constituted their "greatest" problem. Some typical comments in this category were:

> Continued restraints on budgets. This coupled with space limitations, lack of facilities, inequalities throughout the system, (e.g. rural vs. urban), rising costs of supplies while budgets decline, all create a disagreeable situation.
>
> Not enough time available to be spent out of office and away from paperwork, and the frustration of not being able to spend more time getting to know and to help pupils with learning difficulties.

Conflict between staff and the principal appear to constitute another main area of difficulty for today's principal. Many respondents commented about Bill 100 and the ambivalence this has created in terms of the principal's allegiance to management or to the Federations. The "Unionism vs. professionalism" issue and the growth of teacher militancy were also mentioned as a source of "the greatest problem." Secondary school principals were particularly likely to mention this problem area (42% of secondary school principals in the Public system and 32% of those in the R.C./Pr. schools said this). Slightly over 20% of all elementary school principals commented here, as well. Some typical statements by principals included:

> Is a principal first and foremost a teacher? Or is he/she primarily an administrator? Principals are torn between the rapidly polarizing views of Federations of teachers and those of Trustees and administration. Bill 100, and the "letter of intent" exert pressures on principals to prevent them from maintaining a neutral position. In my opinion, principals are both teachers and administrators and always have been. Any attempt to change this will create an imbalance in what is and has been a finely balanced relationship.

> Principals today are walking a tight-rope. They are torn by the duality of role - teacher and administrator. On one hand, the Federation says that principals are principal teachers who must back the Federation. On the other hand, Boards of Education view principals as extensions of the Administrative staff - "middle men." Bill 100 certainly accentuated the problem. Somehow, ALL concerned must come to grips with the problem and make every attempt to reconcile it.

> The type of contract with our teachers' federations that is being negotiated under Bill 100 will be much more restrictive. Timetabling, teachers' flexibility, assigning special supervision to teachers will be spelled out in such a way that the cooperative teamwork we have enjoyed with our teaching staff will be a thing of the past. Perhaps it can be avoided, but experience in New York State and Quebec indicates a deterioration of our (the cooperative) atmosphere that has made our schools so effective.

The third most commonly mentioned problem area of the principalship concerned conflict of expectations. Ministry, Board, parents, staff, students may all hold somewhat different views on how schools should operate. Many principals commented on the difficulty of trying to serve these many masters simultaneously. Principals in the Separate/Private systems were somewhat more likely to comment about this difficulty of their positions than were those in the Public school system. Indeed, this was the most commonly mentioned problem for each of the three types of Separate/Private schools (44% of R.C./Pr., 35% of Separate elementary English language, and 28% of French language school principals mentioned this problem). One-quarter of Public school principals (both elementary and secondary level) commented about this as well. Some typical statements on this topic were as follows:

> Because the role is undefined, many expectations are placed upon the principal. He must place these expectations in priority order and his role then evolves according to those priorities. His performance will be viewed as satisfactory or unsatisfactory by his superiors according to the placement of their expectations on his list of priorities. This often places him in an unfortunate position.

> Relations between the public, the federation, the government. The principal, as 'person' in the middle, is part of all and responsible to all.

> The greatest problem facing the principalship today is the everchanging and varied expectations of trustees, the Ministry, parents and the business world with regard to so many aspects of the school curriculum.

> (The greatest problem) is in developing a purpose or goals for a school when the number of forces entering the decision and planning process continues to increase. I find a community and the students expect the provision of a sound education. The conflicting forces are found among Ministry of Education personnel, trustees and most recently, the professional Federations' representatives.

The fourth main problem area of the principalship concerns an increase in what the school is expected to do. The principal and the school staff are asked to take on more and more jobs for which they feel they lack adequate training. Principals complained that these "extras," such as special education, community education, sex, drug and moral education, are "piled on" without an accompanying addition of resources. Elementary school principals were more likely to mention this problem area than secondary school principals. Approximately one-quarter of elementary school school principals (all types) and only about one-tenth of principals at the secondary level said that increasing demands were the greatest source of problems for the principal. Some comments from the principals themselves illustrate their feelings about this matter:

> There seems to be a great number of new and added areas of responsibility for schools such as moral education, etc. in all of which the principal is expected to be - and really should be - some kind of expert."

> Principals are asked to assume more of the duties formerly done by Superintendents, especially teacher education. In many instances we lack the expertise to do this task well.

> Principals are being given more and more responsibility - for children's physiological, psychological, social as well as academic development. They are now almost totally responsible for teaching staff (without the attendance selection authority). They are more and more responsible for curriculum development. By the catchy phrase - "The principal is the key..." - it seems to me that no one above or below the principal has to accept responsibility for the children we teach.

The above four areas of difficulty appear to be the central ones to most principals. All other types of comments, which follow, were mentioned by only a small minority (20% or less) of all principals. Of course, as we shall see, a number of these areas were particularly troublesome to principals in certain specific types of schools.

Rapid educational change was a central problem area mentioned by approximately 17% of the overall principal sample. Principals complained about the personal difficulty of keeping up with current trends in education and of the reluctance of some staff members to undergo change. The faddish and bandwagon aspects of some areas of change were also a source of difficulty for many of these principals. Their own comments will serve to illustrate their feelings about this [illegible]

> 1. Constant bombardment from new courses being implemented and evaluated. Too many changes too soon can create bewilderment and concern by teachers and administrators.
>
> 2. Change for the sake of change can create havoc. Therefore, it is imperative that we be constantly on the alert and while being receptive to the winds of change, tread softly in joining up with the many and varied bandwagons.

> Proliferation of philosophies and guidelines with which no teacher can be expected to adequately cope.

> The frequent curriculum changes - the planning, the evaluation, the training seem hardly finished before it's time to start again.

Another problem mentioned by a considerable number of principals concerned the lack of guidance they experienced. These principals feel very isolated in having to make many important decisions without clear-cut guidelines from their Boards and the Ministry of Education. Separate elementary English-language school principals were more likely to make this comment (26% did) than was any other group (about 10% of all others did so). Typical comments included:

> The principalship is a position of leadership. The problem has been lately that because of lack of a "clear" direction from the Province to follow in education, the principal has shouldered the load. Thus, Ministry guidelines (which are so vague as to be ethereal) have been interpreted by principals in so many ways that chaos has developed in trying to interpret what is really happening to education in Ontario.

> The principal is slowly but surely being pushed out to the end of a limb where it is easy for any and all to take "pot-shots" at him or begin to saw the limb off. The principal has little or no defense or support to fall back on other than his fellow principals who are in much the same situation.

> The Ministry has "handed down" too much responsibility to the school, e.g. curriculum planning. The guidelines are useless! They tell us nothing. In my opinion, that accounts for the decline in academic progress among our students regardless of what Mr. Dennis or Mr. Davis say.

> Lack of specific directions from the Ministry - many man hours are wasted - each school, family of schools or board developing own curriculums - extremely inefficient in time and finance - the needs of students will vary but the basics remain the same.

> The Ministry of Education has abdicated its role of educational leadership as have most other educational leaders. They have left it to the principal to say 'this is what education will be in my school - this is what is good for my pupils."

In contrast to the above, a comparable number of principals complained about a loss of autonomy due to increased participation by others in decisions previously made by the principal alone. Despite first appearances, wanting firm guidance and regretting a loss of autonomy are not necessarily logically inconsistent. It is, in fact, particularly difficult for some principals to decide on an appropriate course of action in the face of the combination of a great many opposing pressures and the lack of clear guidance from the authorities to whom they still feel accountable. Secondary school principals were particularly likely to make this comment (34% did, while only about 18% of all other groups did so). Some typical comments in this area were:

> Parent pressure groups, composed of people who know little about education and perhaps less about children and child development, that can impose their will on a school situation and get their way at the expense of organization and pupil benefit - all this with the support of administration - my experience.

> Maintain control of the "ship" - it is becoming more difficult to control decisions in an era of increased participation by many groups in setting educational policies.

> Principals are told that they are responsible for their schools and have all the power in their hands. In reality, we have very little, if any. The Ministry and Administrative staff dictate most of what is done and can be done.

> The principal is being caught in a power struggle among teacher federations, Boards and Ministry. Authority to carry out programs in the school is now being shared among these groups and the principal is becoming a coordinator instead of an initiator.

In the opinion of some principals, the largeness of many of today's schools combined with the larger units of administration has produced a loss of a familiar, personal atmosphere and has resulted in schools becoming like "Big Businesses" or "factories." Approximately 10% or principals made comments in this area:

> I personally see the principalship as evolving into a very impersonal position. I see this as a direct result of creating schools so large that the principal never gets the time he or she needs to get to know the staff and students. The school, to me, is a small community within a larger one - a community where one is exposed to love, concern, compassion; where one develops responsibility, loyalty, and convictions ; and where one grows in wisdom and courage and respect. I believe that the principal's main role is to help create an atmosphere where this can happen.

> There is a move to separate the principal from the teachers. Trustees and administrators seem to want this separation. In my case, as principal of a "combined unit," I am further removed from staff and students than I was as principal of a single school. This move to "combined units," etc. will develop a level of administration between the present principal's role and the role of the supervisory officer. Personally, I am against this move because it is eliminating the personal contact and involvement necessary to make the principal the educational leader of his/her school.

> Greatest problem is the county system. The trustees and senior administration officials are too far removed from the educational activities, and consequently make decisions not in the best interest of the kids. Subsequently, I see how I feel the school should operate but end up curtailed by administration.

Closely related to a number of the above points is the aspect of the principal's job which requires him/her to maintain a high level of enthusiasm among the staff, and a positive atmosphere in the school as a whole. Many principals (approximately 18% overall) named "keeping up morale" as the most problematic aspect of their job. Comments of this type included:

> Maintenance of staff morale whilst encouraging them to adopt current practices.

> The principal must formulate a team relationship with his or her staff - must be one member of the team. He must bear their frustrations (personal, professional, financial, etc.) with a sense of understanding and concern in order to be an effective and efficient administrator within the system. You must be professionally sincere and wise in order to survive.

> Maintaining a high degree of morale among teachers (and therefore students) in the light of decreasing enrollments and increasing pupil-teacher ratio.

Approximately 15% of principals in all groups (except the R.C./Pr. schools, where only one principal made this comment) responded to this question, naming public relations as a central area of difficulty in the principal's role. Commonly named aspects of this point concerned the deteriorating public image of schools and negative coverage of educational issues in the public media. Principals did not, as a rule, complain about difficulties with communication with parents or with the immediate community surrounding the school. Typical comments included:

> P.R. in trying to deal with negative press columns, or releases that tend to influence that part of the community which is not in close touch with the school.

> Schools are under public attack more so now than ever before - more people questioning our directions and priorities and our expenditures. Very low credibility in the eyes of many, particularly where strikes have occurred.

> The greatest problem is to keep the public convinced that the quality and value of education justify its cost.

The last area of problems of principalship mentioned here concerns what principals saw as the declining morality of society as a whole. Some principals said they found it difficult to maintain the standards of previous years in what they felt presently was a more permissive era where former values for high achievement and hard work were eroding.

Approximately 10% of principals made comments of this type. These included the following examples:

> The problem of maintaining order and getting the students to form proper values in a permissive society such as ours.

> Societal influences on the school community. For example, the acceptance of soft drugs as a way of life for young people. Secondly, the lowering of the drinking age and the corresponding problems in secondary and elementary schools.

> It is very difficult to run a "hard " school (where standards of achievement, homework, punctuality, courtesy and effort are important) in a "soft society" (where "me tooism," "I'm O.K., Jack," self-interest, and "do enough to get by" are the prevailing catch phrases).

> Lack of respect of property by youth in the village and surrounding area; damage to school property; vulgar words on buildings written on week-ends.

This concludes the presentation of our findings about how today's principals fulfill their roles and some of the difficulties with which they have to cope in the course of their work. It is only within this overall context of the principal's role that we can try to understand why principals react to the community and to the community school movement as they do. In the remaining parts of this section, we will look at some specific aspects of the principal's role in relation to the community in particular.

(e) What Role Does the Principal Play in Relation to Parents and Community?

A number of questions scattered throughout the questionnaire asked principals about particular roles they played in various aspects of school-community relationships.

One question asked about the principal's role in relation to any on-going parent volunteer program in the school. Table 44 displays the answers to this question.

About 70% of the overall sample of principals reported that there was a parent volunteer program in their school. Of those elementary school principals who reported having a program, the majority (about 60% of all three types) said that they had been actively involved in the establishment of the program. An additional 20% of all three types of elementary school principals indicated that although not involved in its establishment, they strongly supported the volunteer program. Most of the remaining few elementary school principals said that while they had no active involvement in the program, they gave it their official approval.

The pattern for secondary school principals was quite different. Approximately one-third of all secondary school principals responded in each of the above three categories. That is, about one-third were involved in establishing the program, one-third in strong support, and one-third in official approval without real involvement. Only very few principals (7% or less in any group) said that they had reservations about their volunteer programs. Clearly, elementary school principals are somewhat more likely to be involved in the establishment and maintenance of parent volunteer programs than are secondary school principals.

A similar question was asked about the principal's level of involvement in programs which required students to work outside the school, in the community (e.g. work-study programs in business or industry, regularly using some aspect of community resources). A summary of this information is contained in Table 45.

TABLE 44: Principal's Role in Parent Volunteer Program, in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
Principal's Role	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Actively Involved in Establishment of Program	65.5	59.2	53.5	30.1	29.2
Strongly Support Program, (did not establish)	20.3	21.4	18.6	26.0	37.5
Officially Approve Program, but not in it	12.7	15.5	7.0	38.4	29.2
Have Reservations About Program	1.5	3.9	7.0	5.5	4.2
Total Number of Principals in Schools with Volunteer Programs*	330	103	43	73	24

*Note: 5% of principals in the sample did not respond to this question. Of those who did, 28% reported that there was no volunteer program, in their school.

TABLE 45: Principal's Role in Aspects of School Program, Where Students Work in the Community in 5 Types of Schools

Principal's Role					
Actively Involved in Establishment of Program	40.8	32.6	32.1	28.1	14.3
Strongly Support Program, (did not establish)	39.0	33.7	46.4	45.3	42.9
Officially Approve Program, but not in it	19.5	32.6	32.1	25.9	37.1
Have Reservations about Program	0.7	7.1	1.2	0.7	5.7
Total Number of Principals in Schools where students work in community*	277	86	28	139	35

*Note: 6% of sample did not respond to this question and of those who did, 27% reported having no programs involving students working in the community.

Here again, we find that elementary school principals were somewhat more likely to have been involved in the establishment of such programs (about 35% of all types were) than were secondary school principals (about 20% of both types were). Elementary and secondary school principals were about equally likely to say that although they had not initiated this program, they gave it their strong support (about 40% did so). Nearly all others said they officially approved the program. Again, very few principals (7% or less) expressed some reservation about these programs.

We also asked principals about their degree of involvement in any community-related committees operating at either the level of their own school or at some broader level. Table 46 and 47 display the degrees of involvement which principals have in these two levels of community and school committees.

Table 46 shows this relationship for committees operating at the level of a single school. Over half the principals (60%) in all school types stated that no such committees operated in their schools. The great majority of principals in schools which have such committees indicated that they were actively involved in organizing and coordinating the activities of the group. This was particularly true in all three types of elementary schools, where about 80% of the principals who reported having committees indicated such a high degree of involvement. Slightly over 60% of the secondary school principals reporting committees were also involved to this high degree. Even when these principals were not actively coordinating the group's activities, they were likely to attend most of the meetings. About 15% of all groups of principals who reported having committees, responded in this category, while the remaining few nearly always said that although they didn't always attend meetings, they liked to keep informed about the group's activities. Practically no principals indicated only occasional involvement or none at all with these groups.

TABLE 46: Principal's Involvement in School Level Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools

Principal's Involvement	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Active Organizer/ Coordinator	73.8	84.7	83.3	62.7	63.2
Attend Most Meetings	21.9	11.9	13.3	15.7	15.8
Keep Informed of Activities	3.1	1.7	3.3	15.7	21.1
Occasional or no Involvement	1.3	1.7	0.0	5.9	0.0
Total Number of Respondents with Committees*	160	59	30	51	19

*Note: While the non-response rate for this question was only 2%, over half of the respondents (60%) indicated that no such committee operated in their school.

TABLE 47: Principal's Involvement in General Level Community Committees in 5 Types of Schools

Principal's Involvement					
Active Organizer/ Coordinator	22.7	20.7	50.0	29.2	41.2
Attend Most Meetings	21.6	17.2	10.0	22.9	41.2
Keep Informed of Activities	26.1	24.1	23.3	22.9	11.8
Occasional Involvement Only	19.3	27.6	9.7	16.7	0.0
No Involvement	10.2	10.3	6.7	8.3	6.5
Total Number of Respondents With Committees*	88	29	30	48	17

*Note: While the non-response for this question was 3.5%, most respondents indicated that their school was not represented on such a committee (73% did so).

Table 47 displays the level of involvement of principals with school-community committees operating at a level more general than a single school. Numbers in this table are very small, since about three-quarters of our total sample indicated that no such committee was in operation; this fact must be kept in mind when examining percentage differences among the five groups. Basically, it seems that principals in all types of schools are about equally likely to be actively involved as organizers, to only attend most meetings, to just keep informed of the activities, or to have only occasional involvement with these types of committees. There may be a slight tendency for principals of Separate elementary French language schools and R.C./Pr. schools to be more actively involved than are others, but, because of the small numbers, one has to look at these figures cautiously. Only approximately 10% or fewer principals in all types of schools said that they were not at all involved with these groups if they were in operation.

The last specific area of principal involvement in community-school relations explored in the questionnaire concerned the offering of after-hours activities for youth and/or adults. We asked principals about the nature of their personal involvement in these activities. The response rate in general was very low (see Table 48). Of those that did answer each of the four questions corresponding to four types of involvement, a considerable number did show such involvement. Slightly less than one-half of responding principals said that they were actively involved as organizers and/or coordinators for these activities. About the same proportion of R.C./Pr. and French language school principals said they were active as instructors and/or supervisors, as did about 25% of principals of the other three types of schools. Between 50% and 72% of the principals in the five types of schools indicated that they acted as resource persons to others who organized and supervised the activities. Between 24% and 46% of principals in the different types of schools said that they were involved in these activities in "some other capacity." The latter included acting as liaison between school, community and/or Board of

Education, giving advice and counselling, space allocation, care and maintenance of facilities, and lending of encouragement and support. Because of the low response rates, it is difficult to generalize from this question. However, it does seem that although other agencies are commonly involved in sponsoring these after-hours activities, many principals nevertheless chose to spend considerable amounts of time and energy in relation to these.

This generalization is borne out by the way principals answered another item on the questionnaire. This question asked respondents to state whether or not community use of school facilities placed extra demands on them, as principals. In contrast to the item discussed above, this particular question had a very high response rate. The question contained within it the specific question of whether or not there was any community use of the school's facilities. Table 49 displays the results of the general question. About 40% of all elementary and about 60% of all school principals at the secondary level believed that community use of their school's facility did, indeed, place extra demands on them. The great majority of all types of schools appear to have some community use of facilities. The highest rate of "no use" was among French-language schools (23%) and the lowest, among secondary schools in the Public system (2%). Types of "extra demands" which principals listed as made on them in relation to community use of facilities included supervising building and equipment, taking care of damage, having to open or close the school, organizing, scheduling, paperwork, programming, advising people, handling conflicts, and taking on a variety of other tasks. Typical descriptions of these tasks are given below:

> I have to stay at the school when children are having dancing from 4:00 to 8:00 p.m. I am also responsible in seeing that the school is locked when the lessons are over.

> Attending meetings, etc. You actually end up running the program while in fact it appears as a community effort.

TABLE 48: Principal's Involvement in Youth and/or Adult Activities in 5 Types of Schools

Principal's Involvement	Elementary Public (%)*	Elementary Separate English (%)	Elementary Separate French (%)	Secondary Public (%)	Secondary R.C./Pr. (%)
Active Organizer/ Coordinator	40.8	42.1	63.4	44.4	48.5
Instructor &/or Supervisor	20.6	29.2	48.6	21.2	46.4
Resource Person	50.4	59.7	66.7	55.6	72.7
Active in Other Capacity	36.3	32.7	46.2	43.5	23.5

Total Number of Respondents: Total number of respondents varied from item to item and cannot be given here. The overall response rate was very low, with non-response rates for different groups for each of the four categories above varying from a low of 20% to a high of 68%

* Percentages do not add up to 100% as each principal would be involved in one or more capacities.

TABLE 49: Extra Demands on Principal Resulting From Community Use of School Facilities in 5 Types of Schools

Extra Demands					
Extra Demands Made on Principal	47.5	38.0	46.7	69.6	57.1
No Extra Demands	42.7	43.7	30.7	28.5	30.6
No Community Use of School Facility	9.8	18.3	22.7	1.9	12.2
Total Number of Respondents	393	142	75	158	49

> Requisitions must all pass through me to the local trustee for his approval and then sent by me to the Board office.

> Time .. Energy .. Work - But it's worth it. People are happy.

> Keeping the custodian happy when dance groups mar the gym floor.

> Pacifying teachers whose classrooms have been upset by night-school and week-end classes.

> Liaison with outside organization and groups - establishing guidelines, helping them to get organized, publicity, etc.

One last item on the questionnaire explored the question of what single person at a school takes the greatest responsibility for organizing and/or supervising any community-related activities. These activities include, in one summary item, all of the varieties already described in this report.

Table 50 displays the results of this question. Clearly, the principal sees herself/himself as the single person, in any kind of school, who has the greatest responsibility for community-related activities. Principals said they served in this capacity in slightly over 40% of all secondary schools, in over 50% of Public elementary schools and in about 60% of Separate elementary schools. There appears to be no other person taking the single greatest responsibility for these activities to nearly the same extent in any type of school. Vice-principals were said to have this responsibility in 16% of secondary schools, but in less than 4% of any other types of schools. Similarly, community school coordinators and parents each were said to take this responsibility in 19% of French language schools but less than 10% of any other type of school. Again the job was said to be held by a teacher in only 10% or less of any school type,

TABLE 50: Who Takes the Greatest Responsibility for Organizing and/or Supervising Community-Related Activities in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
Who Responsible	Public (%)*	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
No Single Person	28.1	24.6	10.7	31.4	44.2
Principal	51.5	64.4	55.9	43.5	41.7
Vice-Principal	1.7	3.4	1.7	15.6	2.3
Teacher	3.3	6.8	6.8	9.5	7.0
Community School Coordinator	8.6	6.8	18.6	7.5	2.3
Parent	9.7	5.9	18.6	2.7	4.7
Other	10.0	2.5	8.5	10.2	7.0
Total Number of Schools with Community Related Activities	359	118	59	147	43

* Non-response was very low (1.6%). However, many principals answered in two or more categories and the first two of these were coded. Therefore percentages add up to more than 100%.

while "others" were said to take over in another 10% or fewer cases. Although many principals indicated that no single person held the responsibility for community-related activities one can be quite certain that the principal is among those who share this task.

This concludes the description of our findings about the ways in which principals are involved in particular aspects of community-school relations. We now turn to look at how principals view this aspect of their overall role, and what helping and hindering forces they see to the further development of the community school movement.

(f) How Do Principals Feel About Being Involved in Community-School Relations?

A number of questions in the inventory explored principals' feelings about and attitudes toward particular aspects of school and community relations.

The first of these, which was asked in relation to the question of how the principal spent his time, also asked respondents to indicate the amount of time they would prefer to spend on particular types of activities, such as community relations. This question has already been discussed - see Section 3, part (a) - and we have seen that slightly more of all five groups of principals would have preferred to spend a lot of time at parent/community-related activities than were currently doing so. The same data, looked at in a somewhat different way from the way they were described in the previous section, are presented in Table 51. For this analysis, each respondent was given a score of wanting to spend more, less, or the same amount of time at this type of activity. Table 51 shows that approximately 40% of elementary school and 55% of secondary school principals would like, in fact, to have more time to spend on parent/community-related activities. Fewer than 10% of principals in any category said they wanted to spend less time, while the remaining principals (about one-half of all) do not want a change in this respect.

TABLE 51: Principals' Preferences Regarding Spending More, The Same, or Less Time with Parent/Community Activities Than They Currently Do in 5 Types of Schools

Principals' Preferences	Elementary Public (%)	Elementary Separate English (%)	Elementary Separate French (%)	Secondary Public (%)	Secondary R.C./Pr. (%)
Wants to Spend More Time	40.6	40.7	44.6	55.7	54.2
Wants to Spend Same Amount of Time as Now	52.4	52.1	45.9	41.1	39.6
Wants to Spend Less Time	6.9	7.1	9.5	3.2	6.3
Total Number of Respondents	389	140	74	158	48

Another question asked principals about their degree of satisfaction with the quality and amount of communication they had with parents in their school. Table 52 displays the principals' answers to this item. The majority of the responses tend to be toward the centre of the scale (i.e. "somewhat" rather than "very"), showing that principals have mixed feelings about this topic. The most 'satisfied' group are French-language principals, one-half of whom said they were "very satisfied" with their communication with parents. Elementary school principals are more satisfied than are secondary (only 13% of the latter said they were "very satisfied"). On the other hand, 5% or fewer of any group of principals said they were very dissatisfied with this.

When asked whether they would like parents to take more initiative in approaching them and their staff about school-related matters, most principals indicated that they would prefer this (see Table 53). About 60% of elementary school principals and about 75% of secondary school principals said that there was a need for parents to take more initiative in this direction.

Comments made by principals in relation to communication with parents included the following:

> At the senior school level, many parents are very aware of their son's or daughter's problems and are therefore reluctant to come to the school to be told the "same old thing". We have to develop a more positive approach and share the responsibility rather than simply blame parents. They still feel very uncomfortable in our schools. Once real communication is established, parents tend to be positive and supportive. We have to make the first move and prove our sincerity.

> Many parents are reluctant to contact the school because their children urge them not to and because there is a fear that if a parent complains, it will be taken out on the child.

TABLE 52: Principal's Level of Satisfaction with Parent Communication in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Principals' Satisfaction					
Very Satisfied	36.8	38.5	50.7	13.5	12.5
Somewhat Satisfied	48.8	44.1	37.3	54.5	54.2
Somewhat Dissatisfied	13.6	16.1	6.7	27.6	31.3
Very Dissatisfied	0.8	1.4	5.3	4.5	2.1
Total Number of Respondents	381	143	75	156	48

TABLE 53: Principals' Opinions About Parent Initiative in Approaching School Re School Matters in 5 Types of Schools

Principals' Opinions					
Need More Initiative	59.0	60.8	54.7	76.4	70.8
Take Right Amount Now	40.8	37.8	44.0	23.6	29.2
Take Too Much Now	0.3	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	390	143	75	157	48

> Our parents seem problem-oriented - i.e. they approach the school when they have a problem. Seldom do we have parents contact us because they have indications of a need - and are offering to help or to discuss school policy.

> There is a constant and pressing need for school personnel to, in fact, make the school a friendly, responsive, supportive and productive place for parents to be. We cannot just "sit back" and say "they're not interested." We have to take positive actions.

Another question asked principals about their feelings concerning the general topic of community use of school facilities. Table 54 displays the pattern of responses to this question. The great majority of principals appear to be in favour of the idea of community use of school facilities. In fact, most principals said they were "very much in favour." For example, 80% of French-language, 70% of secondary, 60% of English-language elementary (both systems), and 40% of R.C./Pr. school principals responded in this category. The last-named, as a group, appear to have most reservations, with 15% responding that they were opposed ("somewhat" or "very"). This was, however, the highest rate for "opposed." Very few members of all other groups responded in this manner. Most principals, it seems, do favour community use of their school's facilities. Their attitudes are shown by some typical comments:

> I am in favour of use of school buildings by the community, providing the buildings and equipment are utilized with the respect due to facilities provided by the public.
>
> Discipline and behavioural expectations for after-school and evening activities should not show great variance to expectations for the same children in the regular school program.

> It is imperative that consideration be given for budget allowances for these programmes. The design of building should consider community use, i.e. academic rooms should be closed off for some activities and school designs do not always facilitate this. Gyms and showers should be accessible to outdoors.

TABLE 54: Principal's Attitude About Community Use of School Facilities in 5 Types of Schools

Principal's Attitude	Elementary Public (%)	Elementary Separate English (%)	Elementary Separate French (%)	Secondary Public (%)	Secondary R.C./Pr. (%)
Very Much in Favour	62.7	56.1	80.0	68.4	40.9
Somewhat in Favour	30.2	32.4	16.0	27.8	43.2
Somewhat Opposed	3.1	5.0	4.0	3.2	13.6
Very Opposed	1.0	1.4	0.0	0.6	2.3
Total Number of Respondents	391	139	75	158	44

> Board policy is very much in favour of community use of school facilities as long as there is no personal financial gain for individual groups. As principal and as an individual, I am most positive about this because of the public relations potential with the community. With the exception of our resource centre, this school is constantly on the go from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. most school days and most weekends as well. We have hosted everything from medical clinics through baptisms to weddings in our facilities. Our community relationship is high and I credit night school and other community use of our building very highly for promoting this relationship.

(g) Principals' Perceptions of Supportive Factors For and Of Barriers to Community Involvement in School

A number of questions explored principals' perceptions of those factors which favour as well those which impede the development of greater levels of community involvement in schools.

The first of these questions asked principals to rate the degree to which each of a number of groups was in favour of increased community involvement at their particular school. Table 55 displays the results of this question. The original response scale used on the questionnaire had five items: "very much in favour," "somewhat in favour," "a little in favour," "not at all in favour," and "don't know." Table 55 shows only the first two of these choices, combined to indicate that the particular group in question does favour (either "very much" or "somewhat") the idea of greater community involvement at the school, The Ministry of Education is seen by nearly all principals as favouring community involvement (71% of principals in R.C./Pr. schools and 94% of those in the other four groups saw the Ministry as being in favour). Similarly, Board of Education trustees and administration are each seen as being favourable to community involvement by most principals (about 65% of R.C./Pr group and about 80% of the other four groups). Also, the principals said that they themselves were in favour (80% overall did so).

TABLE 55: Principals' Perceptions of What Groups Favour ("Very Much" or "Somewhat") Increased Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Principals' Perceptions					
Ministry of Education	93.4	93.5	94.7	94.3	71.1
Board Trustees	82.9	81.4	84.0	89.8	68.2
Board Administration	73.6	76.2	82.4	79.6	65.1
School Staff	46.1	43.1	54.1	43.7	45.5
Students	40.4	43.7	60.6	31.8	45.2
Parents/Community	48.9	43.8	68.5	47.1	58.1
Principal's Teachers' Federation	53.5	41.9	75.3	32.3	34.9
Principal, himself	78.7	82.8	86.7	82.6	83.7

Total Number of Respondents: Cannot be given as this varies from item to item. Non-response rates were always under 5%.

However, other groups are seen as favourable by a much smaller proportion of principals. With a few exceptions, somewhat fewer than half of principals in each group see school staff, students, and the parents themselves as being in favour of community involvement. Slightly more French-language principals (about 60% in each case) saw all three of these groups as being favourable and about 60% of R.C./Pr principals saw the parents and community as being in favour of community involvement. As for the principals' teachers' federation affiliates, these tended to be seen as favourable by fewer principals, overall, than for any other group. However, 75% of French-language, and 54% of Public elementary principals still saw these as basically favouring community involvement. Only about one-third of secondary school principals, however, answered in this way. Basically, it seems that principals view educational authorities as being more favourable to the idea of community involvement than they do those who are on the spot: parents, teachers, and students. Principals, however, are close to the authorities in that they themselves are, for the most part, in favour of community involvement.

Principals were asked to comment on what factors they saw as being the support needs for greater community involvement in their schools. This was an open-ended question, answers to which were coded into nine possible categories. Up to four items could be coded per respondent. Results are displayed in Table 56.

The employment of a community-school coordinator, or other person working in a similar capacity at either the school or the Board level, was mentioned as a need by about 8% of principals in each of the five groups. Typical principal comments in this category were:

> A full-time person to plan and organize programs for the purpose of bringing the community to the school.

> The recent employment of a community school coordinator at the nearby high school has been an excellent support for all schools in the community.

TABLE 56: Principals' Perceptions of Support Needs for Increased Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools

Support Needs	Elementary Public (%)*	Elementary Separate English (%)	Elementary Separate French (%)	Secondary Public (%)	Secondary R.C./Pr. (%)
Community School Coordinator	9.4	6.5	6.5	8.2	11.5
Extra Funding	23.5	18.5	3.2	35.2	34.6
Principal or Board Endorsement	10.7	13.0	8.1	4.1	23.1
School Staff Support	8.8	13.9	3.2	9.0	15.4
Extra Time/Help	39.7	35.2	8.1	33.6	19.2
Extra Support Staff	5.9	4.6	1.6	8.2	11.5
Good Programming	8.8	9.3	17.7	9.0	15.4
Better Facilities	8.8	13.0	1.6	4.9	15.4
Better Communication with Community	12.1	16.7	38.7	10.7	11.5
Community Support	23.5	31.5	22.8	21.3	19.2
None Needed	5.5	1.9	3.2	3.3	0.0
Total Number of Respondents	307**	108	62	122	26

* Percentages do not add up to 100% as each respondent could name several support needs.

** Non-response rate for this question was 25%.

Extra funding was one of the most frequent needs mentioned. One-third of all secondary school principals and about 20% of English language elementary school principals mentioned this item (only 3% of principals in French-language schools did so).

The personal support or endorsement of the principal with that of the Board of Education was one item among the responses. About 10% of most groups of principals and 23% of those in R.C./Pr. schools mentioned this.

Endorsement by the school's staff was seen as a support need by about 10% of all principals, without major differences between groups. Typical principal comments included:

> When a staff develops the confidence to see themselves as competent professionals, they then have no fear that community involvement in the school is going to be critical, negative or non-supportive.
>
> Greater acceptance by teaching staff that such involvement is not threatening.
>
> I feel that it is vitally necessary to have all staff supportive of community involvement and ready to spend time in sharing ideas with members from the local community.

The need for extra time or extra help (such as leaders) was another very commonly mentioned item. About 35% of English-language elementary principals and secondary school principals in the Public system noted this as something needed before more community involvement could take place. Only 8% of French-language and 20% of R.C./Pr. school principals mentioned this item. A related item - that of the necessity of extra support staff such as secretaries or caretakers - was mentioned by about 6% of all groups of principals. Typical comments of these types were:

> Program staff, probably from City Recreation and Parks Department.

> Multi-ethnic resource people.
>
> Leaders - teachers today have a heavy load, at least in a small school with a levels program. If parents can't or won't be the leaders and expect the teachers to run the show, it can't be done.

The need to design after-hours programs which would be suitable and responsive to community needs was another need mentioned by principals. About 10% of all principals suggested this item as a necessary element of increased community involvement. Their comments included:

> As support staff: clearly defined strategies and reasons, plus specialized instructional materials for parents working with children in programs. Frequent follow-up sessions with parents working in program - study and react to their input, feelings, etc.
>
> Focused projects, activities, developed through staff, student and parents' consensus.
>
> More social workers for welfare recipients. Adult education courses offered within Ontario Housing Buildings so that parents may upgrade their own personal education.

Approximately the same proportion of principals saw a need for better facilities and/or equipment.

The need for improved communication with the community was mentioned by about 12% of most groups of principals, and by nearly 40% of those in French language schools. Principal comments included the following:

> An understanding of the teacher, his role, his philosophy, his methods, etc. by the parents.
>
> Public relations personnel - teachers are not vocal people in relating to the community what they are doing. They rely on the students to inform the community.

> Just that information to the community of the programs operating in the school needs to be publicized either through a Board Newsletter or a calendar outlining courses etc. being distributed to the householder.

> "Better understanding of the school system by parents.

The support of the community was another need commonly mentioned by principals (about 22% overall). Only 5% or fewer of principals in any school type said that no supports were needed for greater community-school development. Typical comments included:

> The school system needs the support of the media. There has been an inestimable amount of damage done in the past year by the biased coverage the media has given to education and teachers. This is reflected in the attitude of some parents."

> Support from community members to take the responsibility re implementing and supervising programs."

> Community confidence that they can do things that will have a real payoff!"

An accompanying question to the above asked principals to identify those factors which created major barriers to the development of community involvement at their school. This was another open-ended question and the principals' responses were coded as belonging to one of twelve possible categories. Up to five responses per questionnaire could be coded. Table 57 displays the pattern of these responses.

By far the most commonly mentioned barrier to community involvement was that of parental and community apathy. About 35% of most principals (17% of R.C./Pr. ones) noted that the parents or the community just were not interested in such participation. A related item - that of other commitments made by parents or community - was also frequently mentioned. About 20% of elementary principals and about 8% of secondary principals said that members of their communities were

TABLE 57: Principals' Perceptions of Major Barriers to the Development of Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
Major Barriers	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Apathy of Parents/ Community	36.1	36.4	31.8	39.7	17.1
Other Commitments of Parents/Community	21.3	21.5	13.6	13.2	5.7
Finance Problems	18.6	18.3	6.1	25.7	28.6
Lack of Leaders	17.8	21.7	6.1	18.4	11.4
Staff Concerns	13.6	10.0	19.7	14.7	5.7
Vandalism	1.8	4.1	3.0	2.9	0.0
Distance of School From Community	9.5	17.5	10.6	18.4	22.9
Inadequate Facilities	10.3	15.7	7.6	5.9	14.3
Lack of Principal or Board Support	6.8	10.8	7.6	5.9	14.3
Lack of Time	8.9	7.5	6.1	6.6	11.4
No Barriers	6.8	2.5	1.5	3.6	5.7
Total Number of Respondents	338	121	66	136	35

Note: Since up to five responses per principal could be coded, percentages do not add up to 100%. Non-response rate for this question was 16%.

simply too busy to take part in community-school activities. Combined, these factors of reluctance or inability on the part of parents or community members account for by far the greatest source of constraints, at least in the opinion of principals. A number of typical comments in this category are given below:

> Many single parent families. Many families with both parents working. Majority of parents are too preoccupied with earning a living. Low formal educational experiences of many parents.
>
> Both parents working, disinterest, lack of community spirit, social problems, economic pressures.
>
> I have offered this as a community school as per our Board policy, but have received little interest. This is a new community with 75-80% of both parents working. There appears to be little time on the part of the community to pursue this.
>
> The multiplicity of organizations in our society today and more particularly within our own community, has so many of our parents involved for much of their leisure time. Family situations where both parents are working is also a factor.
>
> The attitude toward involvement is, on the whole, negative. Parents will turn out 100% for any program that the children are putting on, but prefer to leave the running of the school to the principal and teacher.

Other commonly mentioned barriers to community involvement were: finance problems for these "added on" activities (mentioned by about 15% of elementary and 25% of secondary school principals) and lack of leaders, instructors or supervisors for activities (mentioned by about 15% of principals overall).

Fear or concern of school staff regarding disruption of the regular school program by the community (mentioned by 15% of most groups and by 6% of R.C./Pr. school principals) was another category of response.

Typical comments here included:

> The insecure principal and/or teacher who feels vulnerable to negative criticism.
>
> Personal preference of the teachers who do not wish "outsiders" in their "domain."
>
> Suspicion on part of schools that parents and community will take over.
>
> Some teachers do not commit themselves wholeheartedly for fear of getting extra work.

Distance (both social and physical) between the school and its community (10% of elementary and 20% of secondary school principals mentioned this) was yet another type of comment:

> Language barrier. Ethnic background makes parents wary of school. A number of different ethnic groups who want to retain their own group.
>
> There appears to be a reluctance or hesitancy on the part of both the teachers and the community to relate to each other more freely. The community seems to be intimidated by the school environment and the teachers feel intimidated and threatened by parents in the school.

Other items were somewhat less frequently mentioned. Inadequacy of school facilities or equipment was considered a main barrier to community involvement by about 10% of the overall sample, as was the lack of principal or Board support. Vandalism problems were seen as a barrier by only a few principals (4% or less in any group). Lack of time for appropriate planning and organizing was mentioned as a barrier by 6% to 12% of principals in different types of schools. A few principals (under 7% in any group) said they saw no barriers to the development of community involvement.

(h) Principal's Preparation For Dealing with Community Involvement

It is evident from all of our findings to this point that today's principals are actively involved in dealing with the community in many different ways. One of the last questions explored the principals' feelings regarding the skills and resources they personally needed to acquire in order to deal more successfully with community involvement. Table 58 displays the pattern of the principals' responses to this open-ended question to which answers were coded into one of nine possible categories. Up to two categories per respondent were coded.

As indicated, this question came at the end of the rather lengthy questionnaire. Perhaps because of this, the response rate was rather low. About 30% of the principals did not respond at all, while an additional 5% indicated that they could not do so. Because of this low response rate, percentages in Table 58 should be interpreted with some caution.

It does seem clear, however, that the kinds of skills many principals would like to have include better interpersonal skills for dealing with adults (other than teachers) - something for which they have had little prior training. About one-third of all respondents to this question mentioned this as a personal need. Some of their comments included:

> Skills to listen, absorb, understand, communicate and be sensitive to all feelings, concerns and support.
>
> More training in "active listening techniques" and assertiveness training.
>
> Skill to handle the "politics" of the various diverse communities we serve.

TABLE 58: Skills or Resources Which Principals Feel They Personally Need To Acquire In Order To Deal More Successfully With Community Involvement In 5 Types Of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
Skills/Resources	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
More Money/ Resources	8.1	9.8	14.3	12.5	3.7
More Time	20.8	18.5	24.1	26.0	40.7
More or Better Staff	13.4	20.7	55.1	17.3	7.4
Interpersonal Skills re Adults	32.1	45.7	34.5	29.8	33.3
Better Understanding of Community School Concept	30.3	40.2	20.7	23.1	25.9
Don't Want to Develop in this Direction	3.2	0.0	6.9	5.8	7.4
No Skills/ Resources Needed	18.5	7.6	3.5	14.4	7.4
Total Number of Respondents	254	92	29	104	27

Note: There was a very high non-response rate of 30% for this question. Those answering could have up to two items coded for their response, and about 40% did so.

> Your concern for people as individuals has to give you the insight to deal with each person or incident as it arises.

A better understanding of the entire concept of community schools was also mentioned as a personal need by approximately the same proportion of respondents (one-third). It seems that there is much ambiguity about, and many possible interpretations for this concept. Typical comments here included:

> To encourage all things that fit the aims and objectives of education in the total community and society in general.

> Greater knowledge of the legal aspects of community involvement. An opportunity to participate with other principals and teachers in training programs to develop skills.

> Exposure to existing successful programs and guidance from experienced people.

> Assessing and prioritizing needs/interests of community then translating same into well organized (meaningful) activity.

Taken together, the needs for more skills in dealing with adults and more understanding of the community school concept represent a strong request for more support.

"Systems" resources were also mentioned as "needs" by many principals About 10% wanted more money or resources, about 20% would like more time, personally, to spend on this (40% in the case of Separate elementary) and about 15% would like more, or more skilled staff (55% for French-language principals). Comments in these areas included:

> Time management - ability to be a full-time educator and a full-time community worker!

> Community school office with separate phone number. Ensurance that prime responsibility for use of building rests with Principal and Staff under his jurisdiction.

> Right now, what I need most is a reasonable capital budget (perhaps $10.00 per student) to stimulate other resources from the community.

> The persuasive powers to change teachers' opinions to show that the benefits outweigh the disadvantages.

> Facility in several languages and time to knock on many doors in the evening over a wide area.

A few principals (less than 8% in any category) were somewhat negative about the question, saying they had no personal desire to develop in the direction of greater community involvement:

> A real personal commitment to develop this type of community involvement. The potential is probably there, but I am not willing to expend the extra time and energy it takes.

> It is not skills that I personally need as much as time and a desire for involvement. I have little time to be freed from church and school as it is; I see myself first as a teacher.

Another few principals (15% of Public and 7% of Separate) said that they already possessed all the skills they felt were necessary.

We asked the principals to indicate who, they felt, should help them develop in this direction. Table 59 displays the principals' responses to this question.

The most commonly mentioned source of potential training was seen to be the Board of Education. About two-thirds of elementary, and one-half of secondary school principals made this suggestion. The second most common choice was the Ministry of Education. About one-third of

TABLE 59: Principals' Choices for Who Should Help to Develop Their Skills Needed for Greater Community Involvement in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Separate	
Who Should Help	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Ministry of Education	30.8	36.1	36.7	26.9	20.0
Teachers' Federation	5.7	2.5	15.0	10.0	6.6
School Board	61.9	62.3	70.0	55.4	40.0
Workshops/ Conferences	3.8	6.6	8.3	3.1	10.0
Non-Educational Organizations	3.5	3.3	0.0	4.6	10.0
The Public	6.0	5.7	5.0	6.9	3.3
Principal, him/herself	9.5	5.7	3.3	6.9	10.0
No Need to Develop	4.1	1.6	0.0	7.7	10.0
Total Number of Respondents	315	122	60	130	30

Note: There was a 20% non-response rate to this question. One-quarter of respondents were coded in two categories.

elementary and one-quarter of secondary school principals answered the question in this way.

Approximately 10% of all principals suggested that their teachers' federation affiliate should take on this responsibility. Other categories of responses, made by 10% or fewer principals in any type of school, included workshops or conferences, non-educational organizations such as churches or municipalities, the general public or parents, and the principal himself. A similarly small proportion of principals again responded negatively to the question, stating that they did not wish to develop in this direction.

We will close this chapter with one last finding. Earlier in the questionnaire we had asked principals whether they had attended any community-school related conferences within the past two year period. This information, which is relevant to the question of potential training sources, is displayed in Tables 60 and 61.

Table 60 shows the proportion of principals, from the entire sample, who had attended one or more community-school related conferences in this time period. A surprisingly large proportion of principals have, in fact, gone to such conferences. Nearly 60% of French-language principals have done so, as have almost half of all Public school principals, and about one-third of Separate English-language school principals.

When asked about the degree to which they found these conferences worthwhile, principals showed mixed reactions (see Table 61). Only one-quarter or fewer of those who did attend some such conference said they found it "very worthwhile." Approximately 30% of attenders said that the conferences were "somewhat worthwhile." Proportions of those who said the conferences were not particularly worthwhile varied considerably from a high of 44% (R.C./Pr. principals) to a low of 7% (French-language principals). The remaining number of principals (20% to 40% of each group) did not specify the degree to which these

TABLE 60: Community-Related Conferences Attended in Past 2 Years by Principals in 5 Types of Schools

	Elementary			Secondary	
	Public (%)	Separate English (%)	Separate French (%)	Public (%)	R.C./Pr. (%)
Conferences Attended					
Attended One or More Conferences	45.0	36.6	58.7	47.1	34.0
Total Number of Respondents	396	142	75	157	47

TABLE 61: Degree to Which Above Conferences Were Found to be Worthwhile

Degree Worthwhile					
Very Worthwhile	27.5	14.0	29.5	13.5	6.3
Somewhat Worthwhile	31.9	31.6	25.0	36.5	25.0
Not Very Worthwhile	19.8	14.0	6.8	27.0	43.7
Degree of Worthwhileness Not Specified	20.9	31.6	38.6	23.0	25.0
Total Number of Principals who Attended Conferences	182	57	44	74	16

conferences had been valuable to their development in the direction of greater understanding of or ability to deal with community involvement in school. The mixed feelings of principals are illustrated in the following verbatim comments taken from replies to this question:

> Moderately useful - mainly helpful as a comparative analysis of my own school situation.
>
> Moderately. Mostly enthusiasm but few strategies.
>
> Useless!!! Most people are in the dark ages on this issue.
>
> Most worthwhile - especially an O.I.S.E. course - School and the Community.
>
> Need more of these at the local level where community people can be encouraged to attend.
>
> Pie in the sky fantasies.

(i) Summary of Findings Presented in Section 3

Basic findings for the five school types are presented below.

Public Elementary Schools

Approximate proportions of principals indicating that they were currently spending "a great deal" or "quite a bit" of time on different school tasks were as follows, in descending order: half on administrative tasks; about two-fifths on each of curriculum tasks and teaching-staff-related tasks; one-third on student-related tasks; about one-quarter on each of classroom teaching, supervision of support staff, and community-related tasks; and about one-seventh on professional activities out-of-school.

The above contrasted in many cases with the proportions of principals in these schools who indicated they would like to spend this much time on those activities. These proportions were as follows (same order as above): less than 10% on administrative tasks; three-quarters on curriculum tasks; close to half on supervision of support staff; two-thirds on supervision of teachers; one-quarter on classroom teaching; half on student-related tasks; about 10% on professional activities; and about one-third on community related activities.

The principals' main suggestions for who might take over the less preferred aspects of their jobs were the vice-principals and secretaries.

Factors which significant proportions of these principals found to be sources of constraint in carrying out their roles were as follows, in descending order of proportions of principals: time limitations (about 80%); budget limitations (three-quarters); school space and equipment, and formal administrative procedures (50% each); Board administration (one-third); Board trustees (one-quarter); and Ministry of Education (one-fifth).

The greatest problems facing today's principal were said by these principals to be the following (in descending order of proportions of mentions): lack of resources (one-third); staff conflict, increasing demands and conflict of expectations (about one-quarter each); lack of autonomy and keeping up school morale (about one-fifth each); rapid change, public relations and lack of guidance (about 15% each); and "Big Business" nature of education and the declining morality of society (about 10% each).

In schools with parent volunteer programs, the great majority of these principals were actively involved in establishing and/or supporting these programs. The same was true regarding those aspects of the school program which involved students going out into the community. When these schools had school level community-related committees, principals were nearly always active as organizers and coordinators, or at least, attended most meetings. However, for schools represented on more general-level community committees, less than half of the principals were actively involved with these committees.

With regards to after-hours activities for children or adults, 40% of the principals in these schools with such activities were actively involved as organizers or coordinators. About one-fifth of these principals worked as instructors or supervisors in these programs while half of the principals were available as resource persons. Another third of the principals were involved in these activities in some other capacity.

About 10% of these schools had no community use of their facilities at all. About the same number of principals in schools with some type of community use of facilities said that such use made extra demands on them as said that no such demands were made.

About one-quarter of the principals indicated that no single person at their school took the greatest responsibility for organizing community-related activities. About half of the principals, on the other hand, said that they themselves took on this role.

About 40% of these principals said that they would like to have more time to spend on parent-community-related activities. Nearly all of these principals indicated that they would favour increased community use of the school's facilities.

Principals generally felt that the Ministry and the School Boards were favourable to increased community involvement in their school. However, only about half of the principals, or fewer, felt that the school's staff, students, parents, or their Teachers' Federation affiliates were similarly favourable.

Commonly mentioned support needs for increased community involvement in these schools included extra funding, extra time or help, greater community support and better communication with the community. Major barriers to such development were stated as including parental apathy, other commitments of parents or community members, finance problems, lack of leaders, staff concerns, and inadequate facilities.

The main skills or resources which the principal felt they personally needed in order to deal more successfully with community involvement included more time, more or better staff members, better interpersonal skills in dealing with adults, and a better understanding of the concept of community schools. Most principals stated that they felt it was the responsibility of their School Boards, or of the Ministry of Education, to help them develop in this direction.

Secondary Schools

Principals described the amounts of time they spent on different school tasks. About two-thirds of the principals in these schools indicated that they spent a considerable amount of time on each of administrative tasks and teacher supervision and evaluation. Next, close to half of them spent much time on curriculum-related tasks. About one-third were spending much time on student-related tasks, about a quarter on professional activities, and about one-fifth on support-staff supervision. Very few of the principals in these schools spent a considerable amount of time teaching in the classroom or dealing with the community.

By contrast, only about 15% of these principals said they would prefer to spend much time in dealing with administrative matters. On the other hand, three-quarters would prefer to have such time for curriculum tasks and 85% would prefer this time for teacher supervision. Nearly two-thirds of the principals said they would prefer to have much time for student-related tasks. Only about 10% wish to have this much time for professional activities. However, over a quarter would prefer to have much time for community-related activities.

Principals' most usual suggestions for who could take on the less preferred aspects of their role included vice-principals, secretaries, administrative assistants, and teachers.

Factors which significant portions of these principals named as sources of constraint in carrying out their role were as follows (descending order of mention): time limitations (80%); budget limitations (75%); formal administrative procedures, Board administration, school space and equipment, and teacher federations (about half in each case); Board trustees and Ministry of Education (about one-third each); and conflicts with teaching staff and support staff unions (about one-quarter each).

Principals in these schools named the following factors as the greatest problems for the principalship (in descending order): staff conflict (40%); lack of autonomy (35%); lack of resources, conflict of expectations, and keeping up of school morale (one-quarter each); increasing demands, rapid educational change, the "big business" nature of education, and public relations (15% each); and lack of guidance and declining morality (10% each).

The principals' roles in relation to community involving activities were explored. Slightly over half of the principals in schools with parent volunteer programs were actively involved in or strongly supportive of these programs. The same was true for about three-quarters of the principals in relation to student work in the community. About 80% of the principals with school-level community committees were attending these meetings regularly or were active as coordinators or organizers. This was true of about half of the principals with respect to similar committees operating at a level more general than the school.

Close to half of the principals in these schools were active in coordinating or organizing the after-hours activities for youth and/or adults. About one-fifth of them were also involved in these programs as instructors or supervisors. Slightly over half of these principals were active as resource persons in relation to these programs while about 40% acted in various other capacities.

Some type of community use of facilities was present in practically all of these schools. The principals in 70% of these schools stated that such use placed extra demands on them.

Over 40% of these principals said that they personally took the single greatest responsibility for organizing and/or supervising community-related activities at the school. This role was taken by a vice-principal in about 15% of the cases, and by a teacher in about 10% of the cases. Nearly one-third of the principals stated, however, that the responsibilities were shared by several people.

Over half of the principals said that they would prefer to have more time to spend on parent and community-related activities.

About one-third expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of the communications they had with parents. Three-quarters of them said that parents should take greater initiative in approaching the school.

About two-thirds of the principals said they were very much in favour of community use of school facilities. Almost all were somewhat favourable.

The great majority of principals felt that the Ministry and the School Board were very favourable to increased community involvement. However, fewer than half of the principals felt that school staff, students, parents, or teachers' federations were similarly favourable.

Commonly mentioned support needs for increased community involvement included extra funding, extra time or help, community support, and better communication with the community. Major barriers to such development were parent apathy, other involvements of community, finance problems, lack of leadership, staff concerns, and distance from the community.

Skills or resources which many principals felt they personally needed to acquire in order to deal more successfully with community involvement included more money or resources, more time, more or better staff, greater skill in working with adults, and a better understanding of the community school concept. Main choices for who should help them develop in this direction included the Ministry of Education and the School Board.

Separate Elementary (English-language) Schools

Approximate proportions of principals indicating that they were currently spending "a great deal" or "quite a bit" of time on different school tasks were as follows (in descending order): administrative tasks and curriculum tasks (about 50% each); teacher supervision (40%); support staff supervision and classroom teaching (one-third each); student-related tasks (one-quarter); and professional activities community-related tasks (15% each).

Proportions of principals preferring to spend much time on some of these activities contrasted with the above: less than 10% wished to spend much time on administrative duties; the great majority (about 85%) wanted this time for curriculum tasks; over half did so for supervision of support staff; three-quarters did so for teacher supervision; close to half wanted much time for student-related tasks; and over half wanted this amount of time for community-related activities.

The most usual suggestions for who might take the less desired parts of the principal's role included vice-principals and secretaries.

Factors which significant proportions of principals found to be sources of constraint included (in descending order): time constraints (nearly all); budget limitations (over 80%); formal administrative procedures (three-quarters); Board administration and school space and equipment (60% each); Board trustees (40%); students and community (one-quarter each); and conflicts with teaching staff and support staff unions (20% each).

The greatest problems facing these principals were said to be the following (in descending order): conflict of expectations, increasing demands, and lack of resources (one-third each); staff conflict and lack of guidance (one-quarter each); rapid educational change and lack of autonomy (one-sixth each); and public relations and keeping up of school morale (one-sixth each).

Principals were involved in a variety of community-related activities. Over 80% were strongly supportive of or actively involved in aspects of the school program involving student work in the community. Nearly all regularly attended or organized school-level community committees (where this existed). In schools which had representation on more general-level community committees, about one-third of the principals were active in them.

In schools which offered after-hours activities for children or adults, about 40% of the principals took an active part in these as organizers. Another third acted as instructors or supervisors, while about 60% were resource persons for these programs. Another third participated in some other capacity.

Nearly 40% of the principals in these schools said that community use of their school's facility made extra demands on them. Only in about 20% of the schools was there no such community use.

In about two-thirds of these schools, it was the principal who took on the single greatest responsibility for organizing community-related activities. No other single person took this responsibility very often. In about one-quarter of the schools, no single person took charge, but the work was shared.

About 40% of these principals stated that they wished to have more time to spend on community-related activities. Close to 80% of them said they were in favour of community use of their school's facilities.

The great majority of the principals felt that both the Ministry and their School Board were in favour of increased community involvement. However, fewer than half had the same feeling about the attitudes of staff, students, parents, or teachers' federations.

Major support needs for increased community involvement in these schools were named as including (in descending order): extra time or help and increased community support (one-third each); extra funding (about 20%); and principal or Board endorsement, school support staff, better facilities, and better communication with the community (about 15% each). Major barriers to such development were said to be: parental apathy (one-third); other commitments of parents or community, finance problems, lack of leaders, and distance from community (20% each); and inadequate facilities (15%).

Resources which the principals themselves felt they needed in order to deal more successfully with community involvement included: the community school concept, and better interpersonal skills for working with adults (over 40% each); more or better staff, and more time (20% each).

The common choices of principals as to who should help them develop in this direction were their School Board (60%) and the Ministry of Education (one-third).

Separate Elementary (French-language) Schools

Approximate proportions of principals indicating that they were currently spending "a great deal" or "quite a bit" of time on different school tasks were as follows (in descending order): administrative tasks (three-quarters); curriculum tasks, and teacher supervision (about 60% each); community-related tasks (40%); professional activities (one-third); support staff supervision (one-quarter). Classroom teaching and student-related tasks were each cited by 20%.

Proportions of principals preferring to spend much time on some of these activities contrasted with the above (there was no such contrast for the other items). Only about one-fifth of the principals preferred to spend much time on administrative duties; nearly all wanted much time for curriculum-related tasks; half wanted the time for support staff supervision; 80% wanted it for teacher supervision; and close to half wished to have much time for student-related tasks.

Common suggestions for someone who could take over some aspects of the principal's role included vice-principals, secretaries, and teachers.

Factors which significant proportions of principals found to be sources of constraint included (in descending order): time limitations (almost 90%); budget limitations (three-quarters); school space and equipment (two-thirds); formal administrative procedures, and the School Board (about one-third each); and conflicts with teaching staff, and Ministry of Education (about one-fifth each).

The greatest problems of the principalship were said to be the following factors (in descending order): conflict of expectations (about one-quarter); increasing demands, lack of resources, staff conflict, rapid educational change, and a perceived decline in morality (one-fifth each); and keeping up school morale, lack of autonomy, and public relations (one-seventh each).

Principals were involved in a variety of community-related activities. About three-quarters were actively involved in parent volunteer programs or strongly supportive of such activities. The same was true regarding aspects of the school program involving student work in the community. In schools with school-level community committees, nearly all principals were active organizers or at least regular participants in them. Where the school was represented on a more general-level community committee, 60% of the principals played an active part.

Where schools offered after-hours activities for children or adults, nearly two-thirds of the principals were active as organizers or coordinators. Close to half of principals acted as instructors or supervisors. Two-thirds were available as resource persons while nearly half were active in some other capacity.

Nearly half of the principals in these schools said that community use of facilities made extra demands on them. Another quarter said that there was no such community use in their school.

In over half of these schools, it was the principal who took on the single greatest responsibility for organizing community-related activities. Community school coordinators and parent volunteers each took on this role in about 20% of the schools.

About 45% of the principals stated that they wished to have more time to spend on community-related activities. Over 95% of them said they favoured community use of their school's facilities.

The great majority of these principals felt that the Ministry of Education, their School Board, and their Teachers' Federation affiliate were in favour of increased community involvement in the school. About two-thirds of principals also felt that students and parents were in favour. Slightly over half of the principals considered that their staff were in favour of involvement.

Major support needs for increased community involvement in these schools were named by principals as including (in descending order): better communication with the community (nearly 40%); more community support (one-quarter); and better programming (20%). Major barriers to such development were named as: parental apathy (one-third); staff concerns (20%); and other commitments of parents and community (14%).

Resources which the principals themselves felt they needed in order to deal with community involvement more successfully included: more or better staff (55%); interpersonal skills in working with adults (one-third);

more time (one-quarter); a better understanding of the concept of community involvement (20%); and more resources (15%).

The common choices of principals as to who should help them develop in this direction were the School Board (70%), Ministry of Education (37%), and Teachers' Federation (15%).

R.C./Pr.
Approximate proportions of principals indicating that they were currently spending "a great deal" or "quite a bit" of time on various school activities were as follows (in descending order): administrative tasks (three-quarters); curriculum tasks (60%); supervision of teachers and student-related tasks (about 45% each); supervision of support staff and community-related activities (one-sixth each); and classroom teaching (7%).

Proportions of principals indicating that they would prefer to spend this much time on the activities were in contrast in some cases: only 15% wished to spend such time on administrative tasks; 80% wished this for curriculum tasks; close to half would prefer to spend this much time on supervision of support staff and almost 90% on supervision of teaching staff, and nearly 70% would prefer it for student-related tasks.

Commonly made suggestions for who might take on these less desired jobs included vice-principals, administrative assistants, secretaries, and teachers.

Factors which significant proportions of principals found to be sources of constraint in carrying out their roles were as follows: time limitations, budget limitations and school space and equipment (about 85% each); formal administrative procedures (about 60%); Ministry of Education (close to half); conflicts with teaching staff, and School Board (about one-third each) and with students (about one-quarter).

The greatest problems facing today's principal were said to be the following factors: conflict of expectations (about 45%); lack of resources, and staff conflict (one-third each); rapid educational change, and keeping up school morale (one-quarter each); and lack of autonomy, and the "big business" nature of education (one-fifth each).

In schools that had volunteer programs, about two-thirds of the principals were actively involved in establishing or supporting these programs. Over half of the principals in schools with some type of student work program in the community were actively involved in these programs. In those schools which had school-level community committees, nearly 80% of the principals were regular organizers or attenders of their activities. Over 80% of the principals in schools represented on more general-level community committees were active in these.

With respect to after-hours activities for youth or adults, close to half of the principals were active organizers of these programs. The same proportion worked as instructors or supervisors. Nearly three-quarters were available as resource persons and one-quarter were active in some other capacity.

About 10% of these schools had no community use of their facilities at all. Close to 60% of these principals said that community use of their school's facilities made extra demands on them, while the remaining 30% said that no such extra demands were made.

About 40% of these principals said that they themselves had the single greatest responsibility for organizing or supervising community-related activities in the school. Slightly more said that no single person in the school took this responsibility.

Over half of the principals said that they wished to have more time to spend on community-related activities.

Nearly one-third of principals expressed dissatisfaction with their communications with parents. Over two-thirds of them said they felt parents should take a greater initiative in approaching the school.

Over 80% of the principals said they were favourable to community use of the school's facilities as well as increased community involvement in general.

Principals generally felt that the Ministry of Education and their School Board were also favourable to increased community involvement (over two-thirds of them said this). Nearly 60% also said that the community was equally favourable. Less than half, however, said that school staff and students would favour such increased involvement and only about one-third felt that their teachers' federations did so.

Commonly mentioned support needs for increased community involvement in those schools included: extra funding (one-third); principal or Board endorsement (one-quarter); extra time or help, and community support (one-fifth each); more staff support, better programming, and better facilities (about 15% each). Major barriers to such development were stated as including finance problems (30%); distance of school from community (one-quarter); parental apathy, inadequate facilities, and lack of Principal or Board support (one-sixth each); and lack of leaders and lack of time (10% each).

The main skills or resources which the principals felt they personally needed in order to deal more successfully with community involvement included more time (40%), better interpersonal skills in dealing with adults (one-third) and better understanding of the community school concept (one-quarter). Most principals stated that they felt it was the responsibility of their School Board or of the Ministry of Education to help them develop in this direction.

5 Urban-Rural Differences in Findings

Introduction

In this chapter we will look at the ways in which the findings of our survey of Ontario school principals vary depending on whether the principal's school is located in an urban or a rural environment.

Since the basic findings for all five samples of principals in five types of schools have already been examined (see Chapter 4), the present task is a refined and limited one. We will not look again at all of the great many items covered on the principals' questionnaire, but limit our examination to those selected variables which, for theoretical or practical considerations, might be expected to vary somewhat depending on a school's environment.

As explained in Chapters 3 and 4, the nature of our sampling design limits us to looking at each of five different school types rather than the overall group of all Ontario school principals. Here again, we will have to follow this procedure, so that we will be able to look for urban-rural differences only within each particular school type, such as Public elementary or Separate elementary. Of course, as before, when no differences with respect to a particular variable or factor are found between two or more school types, we will be able to generalize to a higher level such as all Public schools, all elementary schools, or even all schools.

In order to accentuate possible urban-rural differences, we chose to develop a definition of "pure" urban and rural schools. Two questions on the principal questionnaire explored elements related to the school's relative "urbanness" or "ruralness." One of these asked about the size of the population of the city/town/village in which the school was located. This question provided a scale of five categories of sizes for respondents' answers: less than 10,000; 10,000 - 39,999; 40,000 - 99,999; 100,000 - 499,999; and 500,000 or more. The other question asked about the main type of community served by the school. Here the categories of response included the following: suburban; older residential; downtown; small town; and rural.[1]

A cross-tabulation of the answers to these two questions revealed that, in fact, most schools serving "suburban," "older residential," or "downtown" communities were found in cities with populations of 100,000 or more. On the other hand, most schools serving "small town" or "rural" communities were found in towns or villages with a population of less than 40,000.

These facts were used in arriving at a set of "pure" urban and rural schools. We chose to examine, for this set of analyses only, just those schools falling into the above two categories. "Urban" schools are those which have populations of over 100,000 and which serve suburban or older residential or downtown communities. Rural schools are those which serve small towns and/or rural communities and are located in towns or villages of less than 40,000 persons.

Accordingly, the present chapter excludes from its analyses those schools which do not fit into the above categories. Schools which fall into the "grey" area of 40,000 to 99,999 are excluded, as are "suburban," "older residential" or "downtown schools" in smaller towns and "small town" or "rural" schools in larger cities. Also excluded are schools which serve "mixed populations" or draw their students from a variety of community types.

---

1. Basic findings for these two questions are presented in Section 1(a) of Chapter 4 (see Tables 4 and 5).

We will examine urban vs. rural differences only in three of the five school types included in our survey. The two school types with prohibitively small populations remaining after schools which did not "fit" into the above definitions of "pure" urban or rural schools had been removed are Separate elementary schools of French-language and R.C./Pr. schools.[2]

Accordingly, we will look only at Public schools (both elementary and secondary) and at Separate elementary schools where English is the language of instruction. Within each of these three groups, we will examine possible differences between the ways that principals in urban schools vs. those in rural ones answered our questionnaire.

Within the general category of "urban," possible differences between "suburban," "old residential" and "downtown" schools have been examined. However, because of the small number involved, this additional data will only be presented where percentage differences show a strong relationship. The simple urban-rural breakdown will be looked at for all relationships examined in this chapter. However, statistical tables will accompany generalizations only in those cases where some noteworthy difference is found. Tables will display urban-rural differences, or urban type differences, only for those school types where there is such a noteworthy difference.

---

[2] We use the abbreviation R.C./Pr. to designate schools offering secondary programs attended by Roman Catholic students. These schools are administered by two boards: a Roman Catholic Separate School Board (Gr. 9-10) and a Private School Board (Gr. 11-13). For a more comprehensive explanation, see pages 5 and 6.

Urban-Rural Differences in Community-Related Activities in Schools

We examined urban-rural differences with respect to most types of community-related activities covered in our survey.

The first set of these community-related activities concerned communication with parents. We found no differences in the number of times, per week, that principals in urban schools, as opposed to those in rural schools, talked with parents in person or on the telephone. Nor did we note any differences when we broke the urban group into its three elements - suburban, old-residential, and downtown.

With respect to the number of student performances put on by a school during the course of a year, we found no significant differences between urban and rural schools, or between schools in the three types of urban communities.

We looked for urban-rural differences among schools with respect to the number of formal occasions, other than parent-teacher interviews, which the schools provided each year for parents to see the school's operation. Again, there were no significant urban-rural differences, or differences between schools in the three types of urban settings, in any of the three types of schools.

The next set of community school activities concerned the use of parent volunteers by the school.

With respect to the regular use of such volunteers,[3] we found some slight but consistent differences between school types in urban vs. rural settings. These are displayed in Table 62. Although the difference is only between 10% to 15% in each case, urban schools were more likely to use regular volunteers than were rural, in each of the three types of schools. We found no differences with respect to the regular use of volunteers among schools in the different types of urban settings.

---

[3] Basic findings for this item are presented in Section 2(b) of Chapter 4 (see Table 23).

With regards to the occasional or sporadic use of parent or community volunteers, there were no urban-rural or urban-type differences among schools of any type.

The next class of community-related activities for which possible urban-rural differences were investigated concerned a community orientation in the school's daytime curriculum.

We found that there were no urban-rural or urban-type differences between schools reporting that they did or did not have the practice of having the curriculum reflect local community issues.

There was a slight urban-rural difference, in secondary schools in the Public system only, with respect to the frequency of having visiting speakers coming into the classroom.[4] These data are shown in Table 63. Rural schools were more likely to make "frequent" use of such speakers, while urban schools were more likely to make use "sometimes." Schools in both types of settings were equally likely to say that they used visitors "once in a while." There were no differences with respect to this variable, between schools in different types of urban settings.

With regards to field trips to the local community,[5] there were urban-rural differences for all three school types. Table 64 displays these differences.

---

[4] Basic findings for this item are presented in Section 2(b) of Chapter 4 (see Table 25).

[5] Basic findings for this item are presented in Section 2(b) of Chapter 4 (see Table 21).

TABLE 62: Regular Use of Parent Volunteers in Public Elementary Schools in Urban and Rural Settings

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Separate Elementary	
	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)
No volunteers used	16.0(13)	31.1(41)	65.9(27)	75.8(50)	32.6(14)	45.9(17)
Some volunteers used	84.0(68)	68.9(91)	34.1(14)	24.2(16)	67.4(29)	54.1(20)
Total	100.0(81)	100.0(132)	100.0(41)	100.0(66)	100.0(43)	100.0(37)

TABLE 63: Frequency of Visiting Speakers in Urban Vs. Rural Public Secondary Schools Reporting Such Visits

	Public Secondary	
	Urban	Rural
Frequent	53.3(24)	77.3(51)
Sometimes	35.6(16)	16.7(11)
Once in a While	11.1(05)	6.1(04)
Total	100.0(45)	100.0(66)

TABLE 64: Frequency of Field Trips to Local Community in Urban Vs. Rural Schools of 3 Types

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Separate Elementary	
	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)
Frequent	75.6(93)	41.7(63)	77.8(35)	65.2(43)	55.8(29)	19.0(08)
Sometimes	21.1(26)	42.4(64)	13.3(06)	24.2(16)	38.5(20)	57.1(24)
Once in a While	3.3(04)	15.9(24)	8.9(04)	10.6(07)	5.8(03)	23.8(10)
Total	100.0(123)	100.0(151)	100.0(45)	100.0(66)	100.0(52)	100.0(42)

Urban schools were more likely, in the case of each school type, to have "frequent" field trips to the local community than were rural schools, while the latter were more likely to have such field trips "sometimes." Rural schools were also more likely to make such trips only once in a while. Overall, it seems that students in urban schools make significantly more trips to the local community than do rural ones, regardless of whether the school is elementary, secondary, Public, or Separate. When the "urban" category was broken into its three types, there were no further differences.

With regards to students being involved on a regular basis in doing course-work in a community setting, there were no urban-rural differences, nor were there differences in the three types of urban settings.

The next area of community-school relations for which possible urban-rural differences were explored was that of formal groups or committees set up mainly to improve communication between school and community. No differences were found between urban and rural schools with respect to the likelihood of having some such community operating at either the level of the school or at a more general one. Nor was there any difference in the effectiveness, as rated by the principal, of those committees which did exist. Schools in the different types of urban settings did not vary with respect to these factors.

An area of community-related activities - after-hours or weekend activities offered for children, youth, and adults through the schools - was explored. Only one difference was found. Urban schools, of the Public elementary type only, were more likely to offer childrens' or youths' activities[6] than were rural schools of the same type (see Table 65). There were no urban-rural differences for childrens' activities

---

[6] Basic findings for this item were presented in Section 2(c) of Chapter 4 (see Table 26).

TABLE 65: Activities for Children or Youth in Public Elementary Schools in Urban Vs. Rural Communities

	Public Elementary	
	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)
Childrens'/Youths' Activities	92.7(114)	72.4(110)
No Activities	7.3(09)	27.6(42)
Total	100.0(123)	100.0(152)

TABLE 66: Library Open to Public in Public Secondary Schools in Urban Vs. Rural Settings

	Public Secondary	
	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)
Library Open	2.2(01)	27.7(18)
Library Not Open	97.8(44)	72.3(47)
Total	100.0(45)	100.0(65)

in the other two school types, nor for adult activities in any of the three school types. When the urban category was broken into its three elements, no differences were found, for any school type, in relation to activities for children, youth, or adults.

We also looked at the incidence of the school library being open for public use and found that, among Public secondary schools only, rural schools were more likely to do this than were urban schools (see Table 66). Different types of urban schools did not differ with respect to their libraries being open to the public. It should be noted that only a very small proportion (14% or less) of any of the school types had libraries open for public use (see Chapter 4, Section 2(c)).

With regards to schools where some sort of special services, such as medical or legal were offered for the public,[7] we found no urban-rural differences. However, Public elementary schools located downtown were more likely to offer these than were their counterparts in the other types of urban settings (see Table 67).

We also looked for possible differences in terms of neighbourhood improvement projects in which the schools may have participated.[8] We found no differences, in this respect, between urban or rural schools of any type. However, there were differences between schools in the three types of urban settings, for both types of elementary schools. Table 68 displays these relationships. Among Public elementary schools, those located downtown were most likely to participate in such projects, while among Separate elementary schools, no downtown schools participated in any neighbourhood improvement projects, and about one-third of those in the other two urban settings did so.

---

[7] Basic findings for this item were presented in Section 2(c) of Chapter 4 (see Table 31).

[8] Basic findings for this item were presented in Section 2(c) of Chapter 4 (see Table 32).

TABLE 67: Special Services Offered to Public in Public Elementary Schools in 3 Types of Urban Settings

	Public Elementary		
	Suburb % (#)	Old Residential % (#)	Downtown % (#)
Some Special Services	17.7(11)	22.0(9)	50.0(10)
No Special Services	82.3(51)	78.0(32)	50.0(10)
Total	100.0(62)	100.0(41)	100.0(20)

TABLE 68: Neighbourhood Improvement Projects in 2 Types of Schools Located in 3 Types of Urban Settings

	Public Elementary			Separate Elementary		
	Suburb % (#)	Old Residential % (#)	Downtown % (#)	Suburb % (#)	Old Residential % (#)	Downtown % (#)
Some N.I.P.'s	12.9(8)	24.4(10)	50.0(10)	27.3(6)	35.7(5)	0.0(0)
No Such Projects	87.1(54)	75.6(31)	50.0(10)	72.7(16)	64.3(9)	100.0(17)
Total	100.0(62)	100.0(41)	100.0(20)	100.0(22)	100.0(14)	100.0(17)

This concludes the description of our very sketchy findings of urban-rural and urban-type differences with respect to community-related activities in three types of schools. Basically, we found that there were very few urban-rural differences, and even fewer differences between schools located in the three different types of urban settings. We now turn to look at the ways that principals relate to the community in these three types of schools.

Urban-Rural Differences in Principals' Attitude Towards and Participation in Community-related Activities

We examined urban-rural differences with respect to a number of items related to the principal's attitude towards and participation in community-related activities.

Urban vs. rural principals, or principals in any of the three types of urban settings, indicated they currently spent about equal amounts of time on community-related activities. The amounts of time they said they would prefer to spend in this direction showed no differences either. This was true for principals in all three school types.

We had asked principals to indicate the degree to which they would prefer to involve parents and community members in a variety of school decisions. With respect to curriculum-related decisions, more principals of rural schools than of urban schools, in all three types, indicated that parents should be so involved ("a great deal" or "quite a bit"). Table 69 displays this relationship.

There were no such differences with respect to decisions related to school rules and regulations. However, more principals of Public elementary schools (only) in rural areas than in urban ones expressed a willingness to involve parents and community members in school decisions regarding school philosophy (see Table 70).

Principals of schools in the three different types of urban settings showed no differences with respect to their preferences for involving the community in any of the three types of decision-making.

There were no differences, again, between urban and rural principals, or between principals of the three types of urban settings with respect to the degree to which they saw parents and community members as sources of either constraint or of help in carrying out their roles as principals.

TABLE 69: Principal's Opinion Regarding Parent Involvement in Decisions Affecting School Curriculum in 3 Types of Schools in Urban and Rural Settings

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Separate Elementary	
	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)
Should be involved 'a great deal' or 'somewhat'	62.6(77)	77.9(116)	56.8(25)	71.2(47)	82.7(43)	92.3(36)
Should be involved 'a little' or 'not at all'	37.4(46)	21.1(33)	43.2(19)	28.8(19)	17.3(9)	7.7(3)
Total	100.0(123)	100.0(149)	100.0(44)	100.0(66)	100.0(52)	100.0(39)

TABLE 70: Principal's Opinion Regarding Parent Involvement in Decisions Affecting School Philosophy in Public Elementary Schools in Urban and Rural Settings

	Public Elementary School	
	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)
Should be involved 'a great deal' or 'somewhat'	73.0(89)	89.2(132)
Should be involved 'very little' or 'not at all'	27.0(33)	10.8(16)
Total	100.0(122)	100.0(148

TABLE 71: Principal's Opinion Regarding Parent Initiative in Approaching School in Public Elementary Schools in 3 Types of Urban Settings

	Public Elementary School		
	Suburb % (#)	Old Residential % (#)	Downtown % (#)
Should take greater initiative	45.9(28)	48.7(19)	94.7(18)
Should not take greater initiative	54.1(33)	51.3(20)	5.3(1)
Total	100.0(61)	100.0(39)	100.0(19)

Similarly, we found no such differences in the degree of satisfaction which principals expressed regarding the amount and quality of communication they had with the parents of students in their schools.

Nor were there basic urban-rural differences regarding principals' opinions about parents taking more or less initiative in approaching the school.[9] However, Public elementary principals located in downtown schools were more likely than those in suburban or old residential settings to say that parents should take greater initiative in approaching them or their staff about school-related matters (see Table 71).

Principals in urban and rural schools, and in the three types of urban settings, were about equally likely to be involved in the extra activities for children and adults provided at their schools.

When asked whether community use of their school facility made extra demands on their time,[10] urban and rural principals answered in approximately the same way. However, principals of Public elementary schools which were located downtown were more likely to say that there were such extra demands on their time, than were those in suburban or old residential locations (see Table 72).

Nevertheless, these same principals (Public elementary "downtown") were more likely to say they were in favour ("very much" or "somewhat") of community use of their school's facilities[11] than were Public elementary principals in the other two urban settings (see Table 73). However, Public elementary principals in urban schools were less likely to be in favour of such use than were their counterparts in rural settings (see Table 74).

---

[9] Basic findings for this item are presented in Section 3(f) of Chapter 4 (see Table 53).

[10] Basic findings for this item are presented in Section 3(e) of Chapter 4 (see Table 49).

[11] Basic findings for this item are presented in Section 3(f) of Chapter 4 (see Table 54).

TABLE 72: Extra Demands Made on Principal by Community Use of Facilities of Public Elementary Schools in 3 Types of Urban Settings

	Public Elementary Schools		
	Suburb % (#)	Old Residential % (#)	Downtown % (#)
Extra Demands Made	43.3(26)	39.5(15)	88.9(16)
No Extra Demands Made	56.7(34)	60.5(23)	11.1(2)
Total	100.0(60)	100.0(38)	100.0(18)

Note: Only those schools having some community use of facilities are included in this table.

TABLE 73: Degree to Which Principals in Public Elementary Schools in 3 Types of Urban Settings Favour Community Use of Their School's Facilities

	Public Elementary Schools		
	Suburb % (#)	Old Residential % (#)	Downtown % (#)
'very much' or 'somewhat in favour	54.1(33)	48.7(19)	73.7(14)
'a little' or 'not at all' in favour	45.9(28)	51.3(20)	26.2(5)
Total	100.0(61)	100.0(39)	100.0(19)

TABLE 74: Degree to Which Principals in Public Elementary Schools in Urban and Rural Settings Favour Community Use of Their School's Facilities

	Public Elementary School	
	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)
'very much' or 'somewhat' in favour	55.5(66)	73.8(110)
'a little' or 'not at all' in favour	44.5(53)	26.2(39)
Total	100.0(119)	100.0(149)

TABLE 75: Degree to Which Principals in 2 Types of Elementary Schools in Urban and Rural Settings Favour Increased Community Involvement at Their Schools

	Public Elementary School		Separate Elementary School	
	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)	Urban % (#)	Rural % (#)
'very much' or 'somewhat' in favour	70.5(86)	82.1(124)	73.6(39)	92.3(36)
'a little' or 'not at all' in favour	29.5(36)	17.9(27)	26.4(14)	7.7(3)
Total	100.0(122)	100.0(151)	100.0(53)	100.0(39)

Finally, when asked about the degree to which they were in favour of community involvement in schools in general[12] rural principals were more likely to indicate that they were in favour ("very much" or "somewhat") of such involvement than were urban ones. However, this was true only for elementary school principals, and not for those in secondary schools (see Table 75). No differences with respect to this variable were found among principals in different urban settings, in any school type.

Summary

While we did not examine all possible items in the principal questionnaire for possible urban-rural or urban type differences, those that we did point out indicated that this is not a very fruitful level for analysis with respect to the topic of community involvement in schools.

We found very few differences in the ways that principals in urban as opposed to rural schools responded to our questions. We found even fewer differences for principals in the three types of urban settings - suburban, old residential, and downtown. The findings which did show up are summarized as follows:

Public Elementary Schools

Urban schools of this type were found to be more likely to use parent volunteers on a regular basis, to take more field trips to the local community, and to offer after-hours activities for children, than were rural schools. Among urban schools of this type, those located downtown were most likely to participate in neighbourhood improvement projects. Special services to the community were more frequently provided through downtown urban elementary schools.

---

[12] Basic findings for this item are presented in Section 3(g) of Chapter 4 (see Table 55)..

Principals in rural schools of this type were found to be more open to parent and community involvement regarding decisions affecting school curriculum as well as philosophy and to be more enthusiastic about community use of school facilities as well as community involvement in school, in general, than were their urban counterparts. Among principals in urban schools of this type, those in schools located downtown were most likely to say that parents should take a greater initiative in approaching the school, that community activities made extra demands on their time, and that they were in favour of community use of their school's facilities.

Secondary Schools

Schools of this type which were located in an urban setting were more likely to use parent volunteers on a regular basis, to have visiting speakers in the classroom, and to make field trips to the local community than were rural ones. The latter were more likely to have their library or resource centre open for use by the public.

Principals in rural schools of this type were more supportive of parent involvement in decisions affecting school curriculum than were those in urban schools.

Separate Elementary Schools

Urban schools of this type were more likely to make use of parent volunteers on a regular basis and to make field trips to the local community than were rural schools. Urban schools located downtown were less likely to participate in neighbourhood improvement projects than were those in suburban or old residential areas.

Principals of rural schools of this type were more favourable to the involvement of parents in curriculum decisions and to the involvement of the community in the school, overall, than were their urban counterparts.

6 Findings for Male versus Female Principals

Introduction

As stated in Chapter 3, the research problem of sex differences was not among those originally formulated for this study. In our first sampling of Ontario principals, we were concerned with obtaining sufficiently large groups of principals in the Public and Separate/Private school systems for both elementary and secondary levels, as well as obtaining a large enough French sample to allow us to make generalizations about these groups. After this sampling had been completed and initial contacts with Boards of Education had been established, we were approached with the suggestion of adding enough female principals to the group to allow us to discuss possible male-female differences as well. The identification of female principals proved to be rather difficult, thus the sampling procedures for this part of the study are somewhat more complex than were those for the previous sections. The full details of these procedures are given below. For now, it is sufficient to say that on the basis of our sampling procedures and the high response rate, we feel that we can generalize about male-female differences in each type of school.

Data in this chapter, as in all others, will be presented in terms of each of the five basic school types: Public elementary, secondary schools in the Public system, Separate elementary English language, Separate elementary French language, and R.C./Pr.[1] schools. The reasons for this mode of presentation have been fully discussed in Chapter 3. For each of these types of schools, we will now look for differences in the responses of male vs. female principals.

---

[1] We use the abbreviation R.C./Pr. to designate those secondary level schools administered by a Roman Catholic Separate School Board (Gr. 9-10) and a Private School Board (Gr. 11-13). For a more comprehensive explanation, see pages 5 and 6.

As in our examination of urban-rural differences (Chapter 4), we were selective in the variables for which we looked for possible male-female differences. We only looked at those questions which, for theoretical or common-sense considerations, we felt might show some variation according to sex.

In reporting our findings in this section, we will follow the format used in Chapter 4. That is, while we will report instances of no differences, as well as those where there were some differences according to the sex of the principal, we will present statistical tables only for those relationships where such a difference can be observed. Where a relationship exists for only some of the five school types, only those school types where this relationship is found will appear in a given table.

Although we had opportunity to introduce questions of particular interest to possible male-female differences, it was generally felt that the questionnaire should not be biased in this direction. Accordingly, only one such question was placed into the inventory (Question # 16 - see Appendix A). Findings for this question have not been discussed in previous chapters, so that relevant verbatim comments will be given here.

Sampling for Female Addendum

Since the great majority of principals in our Province are men, our initial sample of principals had a sufficient number of male principals to allow us to look for patterns among them. It was only for female principals that we found it necessary to add to our original sample.

Our initial task was to identify in what proportions female principals did exist in the province. This proved to be somewhat more difficult than we had expected. Total numbers of female principals which we were given by different sources (Ministry, Federations) did not match or were only approximate. Some Federations were reluctant to release this information. We traced official Ministry of Education directories for several past years and through these identified many principals as female. Other female principals were identified through official lists provided by some Federations, and still others by telephone calls made to a number of School Boards.

When we felt that we had, in fact, identified most of the female principals in the Province, we proceded to draw our sample. Basically, we wanted to include one-half of all female principals in the Province in our survey. However, a certain number of female principals had already been picked by chance in our original sampling. Accordingly, we selected enough new female principals to yield a total of 50% for each school system (Public and Separate/Private[2])..

In the case of secondary schools, we followed a different procedure. This group of principals is almost exclusively male, and we had been told that out of five hundred principals in this group, only about "eleven or twelve" were women. We were able to identify only nine. Accordingly, we chose to include all of these female principals, rather than only half of them, in the sample.

In the case of the Separate/Private schools, we already had sampled 100% of all R.C./Pr. principals. Consequently, when we extended our sample to add up to a total 50% sample of all female principals in these systems, the complement was drawn entirely from the elementary schools. Figure 2 summarizes the entire selection process for the female principal sample.

Response rates for the female sample were nearly as high as they had been for our entire study (approximately 75%). Accordingly, the results of the study can be considered representative of the attitudes of both male and female principals in the Province.

---

[2] We use the expression Separate/Private systems to cover the situation of an elementary and secondary school program administered by a Roman Catholic System School Board (K-10) and a Private School Board (11-13). For a more comprehensive explanation, see pages 5 and 6.

Figure 2: Summary of Sampling Procedures for Male and Female Principals

School Type	Estimated # in Ont. Population		Overall % of Original Sample	# in Original Sample		% of Female Sample (Original + New)	# of Females in New Sample	Total # of Respondents (both samples)	
	Male	Female		Male	Female			Male	Female
Public									
Elementary	2462	166	20%	498	27	50%	55	375	51
Secondary	493	9	40%	199	2	100%	7	146	7
Separate/Private									
Elementary English			20%				71**	107	79
Elementary French	932*	358*	40%	244*	108*	50%*		53	28
R.C./Pr.			100%				0	25	24

* This number represents the total of Separate schools - Elementary English, Elementary French, and R.C./Pr.

** This number represents the total of Separate Elementary schools - both English and French.

Although in some cases the numbers of respondents are very small, it should be kept in mind that this is only because the target populations are also very small. In fact, the smallest group (female secondary school principals in the Public system) were all included in our study, as were all principals (both male and female) in R.C./Pr. schools. In the case of these groups, our findings are better than just representative - they include the entire group under question.

FINDINGS ACCORDING TO SEX OF PRINCIPAL

Principal's Background Characteristics

We looked for possible differences between male and female principals in relation to some basic background variables such as age and education. In order to emphasize these relationships, most of these variables were recoded from their original form into two or three subgroups.

With respect to age,[3] we found that in general, female principals tended to be older than were male principals. This was true in all types of schools, except R.C./Pr. ones. In the other four types of schools, between 28% and 44% more women than men indicated that they were 46 years of age or older. Conversely, the same proportion of male teachers, in these categories, said they were 45 or younger (see Table 76).

The variable of educational background[4] was also dichotomized for this analysis (i.e. "less than an M.A." and "M.A. or more"). Again we found a widespread difference between male and female principals. In all school types but one, proportionately more women than men had the lower educational level ("less than an M.A.") while more men had the higher level (M.A. or more). While these differences were small (about 20% in each case) they were consistent among the different school types. This trend was not true, however, for Public system secondary school principals, where a larger proportion of women had the higher educational level (see Table 77).

---

[3] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 1(b) of Chapter 4 (See Table 9).

[4] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 1(b) of Chapter 4 (See Table 11).

We investigated whether or not principals had had vice-principal experience[5] and whether these were male-female differences in this regard. Differences were found in elementary schools of English language (see Table 78) where somewhat fewer female principals than male had been vice-principals. In French language schools and in schools at the secondary level, male and female principals had had vice-principal experience in about equal proportions.

We looked, also, for differences in the number of years of experience as principal.[6] Again, years of experience were dichotomized ("up to 5 years" and "6 years or more"). We found that in the Public system, women tended to have spent fewer years at the principalship than had men. However, in the Separate/Private systems, this trend was reversed, with the female principals having more years of experience (see Table 79). There were no male-female differences regarding years as principal for French schools.

Female principals, in all types of schools except Separate secondary, have spent more years at their current schools[7] than had the men. Between 10% and 26% more females than males in each school type indicated that they had spent 6 years or more at the school (see Table 80).

---

5. Basic findings for this item are found in Section l(b) of Chapter 4 (See Table 12).
6. Basic findings for this item are found in Section I(b) of Chapter 4 (See Table 13).
7. Basic findings for this item are found in Section I(b) of Chapter 4 (See Table 14).

TABLE 76: Ages of Male and Female Principals in 4 Types of Schools

	School Type							
	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Up to 45 yrs.	65.0	30.8	41.8	14.3	91.6	46.8	88.7	53.6
46 yrs. or more	35.0	69.2	58.2	85.7	8.4	53.2	11.3	46.8
Total number of respondents	374	52	153	7	107	79	53	28

TABLE 77: Education of Male and Female Principals in 5 Types of Schools

	School Type									
	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Less than M.A.	55.5	73.6	64.9	42.9	54.7	74.4	56.6	78.6	36.0	62.5
M.A. or more	44.5	26.4	35.1	57.1	45.3	25.6	43.4	21.4	64.0	37.5
Total number of respondents	375	53	154	7	106	78	53	28	25	24

TABLE 78: Vice-Principal Experience of Male and Female Principals in 2 Types of Elementary Schools

	School Type			
	Public Elementary		Separate Elementary (Eng. Lang.)	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Was a vice-principal	59.0	35.8	50.5	20.3
Never a vice-principal	41.0	64.2	49.5	79.7
Total Number Of Respondents	371	53	107	79

Male Vs. Female Principal Perceptions and Performance Regarding the Principal's Role

We looked for possible differences in the ways that male and female principals spent, and would prefer to spend, their time.[8] The original questionnaire items had asked principals to indicate the degree of time they spent on each of a number of different types of tasks. Responses were, again, dichotomized for the present set of analyses, so that we are looking at the relative proportions of men and women who spend much time ("a great deal" or "quite a bit") or little time ("moderate amount" or "very little") on each particular activity.

---

[8] Basic findings for these items are found in Section 3(a) of Chapter 4 (See Tables 39 and 40).

TABLE 79 Years of Experience of Male and Female Principals in 4 Types of Schools

	School Type							
	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Separate Elementary (Eng. Lang.)		Separate Elementary (Fr.. Lang.)	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Up to 5 yrs.	22.0	38.5	37.3	66.7	40.2	22.8	72.0	29.2
6 or more yrs.	88.0	61.5	62.7	33.3	59.8	87.2	28.0	70.8
Total Number of Respondents								

TABLE 80: Years Spent at Current Schools by Male and Female Principals in 4 Types of Schools

	School Type							
	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Frn. Language	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Up to 5 yrs.	68.0	47.2	45.5	28.6	75.7	65.8	62.3	35.7
6 yrs. or more	32.0	52.8	54.5	71.4	24.3	44.2	37.7	64.3
Total Number of Respondents	376	53	154	7	107	79	53	28

Of the eight types of activities listed in the questionnaire, only half showed any variation in response depending on the sex of the principal. Even among these, the variation was limited to within only one or two of the five school types. Proportionately more female than male principals spend "much" time on curricular tasks and support staff-related tasks (both in Public system secondary schools only - see Tables 81, 82) and on classroom teaching (Public elementary and French language schools only - see Table 83). On the other hand, proportionately more male than female principals spend "much" time on activities related to the teaching staff (see Table 84).

There were no male-female differences observed in relation to time spent on administrative tasks, student-related tasks, professional activities, and community-related activities.

We also looked for possible male-female differences in relation to the principals' preferred ways of spending their time. For each type of task, respondents had been asked to indicate the relative amounts of time they were spending, both currently, and ideally. These two questions were compared, and each person was identified as wanting to spend more, the same amount, or less time on each of the eight types of activities. It was in respect to these scores that we looked for possible variation by sex.

Again, we found only a few relationships. Proportionately more female principals than male in secondary schools in the Public system wanted to spend less time on administrative activities (see Table 85). However, a larger percentage of the same group of female principals (in secondary schools) wanted to spend more time on curriculum-related tasks (Table 86) and on teaching-staff related tasks (Table 87) than did the men in this group. On the other hand, proportionately more male than female principals in Pubkic elementary, French, and R.C./Pr. schools said they would like to spend more time on classroom teaching (see Table 88).

TABLE 81: Time Spent on Curriculum-Related Tasks by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "quite a bit"	48.1	71.4
"A moderate amount" or "very little"	51.4	28.6
Total number of respondents	154	7

TABLE 82: Time Spent on Tasks Related to Support Staff by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "quite a bit"	20.5	42.9
"A moderate amount" or "very little"	79.5	57.1
Total number of respondents	146	7

TABLE 83: Time Spent on Classroom Teaching by Male and Female Principals in 2 Types of Elementary Schools

	School Type			
	Public Elementary		Separate Elementary French Language	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "quite a bit"	22.2	55.8	15.1	32.1
"Moderate amount" or "very little"	77.8	44.2	84.9	67.9
Total number of Respondents				

TABLE 84: Time Spent on Tasks Related to Teaching Staff by Male and Female Principals in R.C./Pr. Schools

	R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "quite a bit"	61.9	31.8
"Moderate amount" or "very little"	38.1	68.2
Total number of Respondents	21	22

TABLE 85: Preference About Time Spent on Administrative Tasks by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
Wants less time than now	70.8	100.0
Wants the same time as now	28.6	0.0
Wants more time than now	0.6	0.0
Total number of Respondents	154	7

TABLE 86: Preference About Time Spent on Curriculum Related Tasks by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
Wants less time than now	5.9	0.0
Wants the same time as now	64.2	14.3
Wants more time than now	29.9	85.7
Total number of Respondents	137	7

TABLE 87: Preference About Time Spent on Teaching-Staff Related Tasks by Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
Wants less time than now	6.5	0.0
Wants the same time as now	51.8	0.0
Wants more time than now	41.7	100.0
Total number of Respondents	139	7

TABLE 88: Preference About Time Spent on Classroom Teaching by Male and Female Principals in 3 Types of Schools

	Public Elementary		Separate Elementary French Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Wants less time than now	16.9	32.7	12.0	32.0	8.7	23.8
Wants the same time as now	39.8	38.8	32.0	32.0	30.4	47.6
Wants more time than now	43.4	28.6	56.0	36.0	60.9	28.6
Total number of respondents	362	49	50	25	23	21

There was no male-female variation in the proportions of principals wanting to spend more, less, or the same amounts of time on activities related to their support staffs, teaching staff, students and communities, or on professional activities.

We looked for possible male-female differences in the factors which principals reported as finding helpful and/or constraining[9] in their performance of their roles as principals. Two items in the principal questionnaire were relevant to this issue. One of these listed twelve possible sources of constraints and asked respondents to rate the degree ("a great deal," "somewhat," "very little," or "not at all") to which they found these constraining. The other question repeated eight of the above items and used the same scale to ask respondents about the degree they had found these helpful in accomplishing their goals.

For purposes of the present analysis, the rating scales used in these questions were collapsed so that those answering "a great deal" and "somewhat" were counted together, as were those checking "very little" and "not at all." We also looked for a degree of consistency between the two questions. That is, if women appeared to find one thing both more of a constraint and more of an assistance, we concluded that no real relationship existed. We are reporting male-female differences only in terms of the factors of constraints. However, it should be noted that where possible relationships were contradicted in the question about sources of help, these relationships were discounted as being insignificant. Thus, the following relationships reported in relation to sources of constraints were either reinforced by the pattern of responses in the "sources of help" question or the latter showed no relationship by itself.

---

[9] Basic findings for these items are found in Section 3(c) of Chapter 4 (See Table 42)..

As in the previous question relating to how the principals divided their time among their different tasks, we found no male-female differences which were consistent among all school types. Any differences which appeared - and often none did - relate only to one or two of the five school types.

Proportionately more male than female principals indicated they found their Board administration a source of constraint. However, this was true only for principals in secondary schools (see Table 89). Women, in French-language schools, were also more likely than men to say that they found Board Trustees to be sources of constraint. However, the opposite was true for R.C./Pr. schools (see Table 90).

Male principals seem more likely to find their students to be somewhat of a constraint than do females. That is, proportionately more male than female principals said that their students were sources of constraint. This was true particularly in three school types - secondary schools, French-language schools, and R.C./Pr. schools (see Table 91). This trend is underlined by the fact that in all five school types, relatively more females than males indicated that they had found their students to be sources of help.

The factor of time - or lack of time - was identified as a source of constraint by relatively more women than men. This was true, however, only at the secondary level (see Table 92).

All other differences which were found were restricted to principals in secondary schools. Relatively more male principals than female principals in these schools reported that the factors of budget, "red tape," support staff unions, and Ministry of Education were sources of constraint (see Tables 92 through 96).

No differences, by sex of principal, were found for the following possible sources of constraints: support staff, teaching staff, parents and community, teachers' federations, space, and equipment.

TABLE 89: Degree to Which Male and Female Principals in Secondary Schools see Board Administration as Source of Constraint

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "somewhat"	45.5	14.3
"Very little" or "not at all"	54.5	85.7
Total number of Respondents	154	7

TABLE 90: Degree to Which Male and Female Principals in 2 Types of Schools See Board Trustees as Sources of Constraint

	Separate Elementary French Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "somewhat"	37.3	55.6	45.5	21.7
"Very little" or "not at all"	62.7	44.4	54.5	78.3
Total number of Respondents	51	27	22	23

TABLE 91: Degree to Which Male and Female Principals in 3 Types of Schools See Students as Sources of Constraint

	Public Secondary		Separate Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "somewhat"	17.5	0.0	32.1	14.8	29.2	17.4
"Very little" or "not at all"	82.5	100.0	67.9	85.2	70.8	82.6
Total Number of Respondents	154	7	53	27	24	23

TABLE 92: Degree to Which Male and Female Principals in Secondary Schools and R.C./Pr. Schools Find Time a Source of Constraint

	Public Secondary		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "somewhat"	81.6	100.0	79.2	100.0
"Very little" or "not at all"	18.4	0.0	20.8	0.0
Total number of Respondents	152	7	24	23

TABLE 93: Degree to Which Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools Find Budget to be a Source of Constraint

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "somewhat"	77.3	42.9
"Very little" or "not at all"	22.7	57.1
Total number of respondents	154	7

TABLE 94: Degree to Which Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools Find "Formal Administrative Procedures" to be a Source of Constraint

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "somewhat"	52.3	28.6
"Very little" or "not at all"	47.7	71.4
Total number of respondents	153	7

TABLE 95: Degree to Which Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools Find Support Staff Unions to be a Source of Constraint

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "somewhat"	28.6	14.3
"Very little" or "not at all"	71.4	85.7
Total number of Respondents	154	7

TABLE 96: Degree to Which Male and Female Principals of Secondary Schools Find the Ministry of Education to be a Source of Constraint

	Public Secondary	
	Male %	Female %
"A great deal" or "somewhat"	39.0	57.1
"Very little" or "not at all"	61.0	42.9
Total number of Respondents	154	7

Male Vs. Female Principals' Professional Relationships

In conjunction with that section of the questionnaire which explored the overall role of the principal, we asked respondents to indicate how, if at all, they felt that their sex affected their professional relationships with a number of different groups. The following six groups were listed in the question: support staff, professional staff, students, parents/community, senior administration of their School Board, and principal colleagues. For each such group, principals were asked to indicate whether the fact that they were male or female helped, hindered, or was not a factor in their relationships with them.

In terms of their relationships with the professional staffs of their schools, the majority of principals of both sexes, in all five types of schools, said that their sex was not a factor in these relationships. A large majority of both male principals and female principals in the five different types of schools responded in this way. Between 19% and 36% of male principals and 23% or fewer female principals in the five school types said that their sex was a helpful factor in relating to teachers. Males said this more frequently in all school types except French language and R.C./Pr. schools. Very few principals of either sex said that their sex was a hindering factor in relating to the professional staff. Only 2% or fewer males and 17% or fewer females said this. Females, particularly in R.C./Pr. schools, were more likely, however, to respond in this way (see Table 97).

The pattern of responses concerning principals' professional relationships with their support staffs was very similar to the above pattern. Again, the majority of respondents indicated that their sex was not a factor in these relationships. Between 56% and 80% of male principals and between 73% and 100% of female principals, in the five types of schools, responded in this way. Men, on the other hand, were again more likely to say that their sex was a helpful factor in relating to support staff. Between 20% and 40% of men in the different school types said this, while only 18% or fewer women did so. Proportionately more men than women responded in this way in all school types, except Public elementary. Again, few people commented that their sex was a hindering factor in this respect. This was said by 15% or fewer men and by 12% or fewer women. There were no differences in the frequency with which men and women made this comment (see Table 98).

The pattern of responses in relation to students again showed similar tendencies. A greater proportion of women than men, in all school types, said that their sex was not a factor in relating to students; however, more men, in all school types, said that their sex was a helpful factor in these relationships. Rarely did anyone, of either sex, say that their sex was a hindering factor. The range of responses for the item "not a factor" was 31% to 66% for men and 67% to 86% for women, while the range for "helping factor" was 34% to 67% for men and 14% to 29% for women. This shows a shift from the previously described relationships in that proportionately more principals of both sexes said that their sex was a helpful factor than did above (see Table 99).

The pattern of responses concerning relationships with the community was very similar to that for students. Between 42% and 67% of male and 66% and 100% of female principals said that sex was not a factor in these relationships. The proportion of women saying this was higher than the proportion of men in all types of schools except Public elementary. Between 33% and 57% of male principals and 24% or fewer female principals said that their sex was a helpful factor in relating to parents. Men made this comment in greater proportion in all school types. Again, few principals indicated that their sex was a hindering force in this respect. However, female principals said this somewhat more frequently in Public elementary and R.C./Pr. schools than did male principals (see Table 100).

The pattern of responses regarding the effect of sex on their relating to Senior Administrations of their Boards of Education shows that the majority of all principals (two-thirds or more) felt that sex was not a factor in these relationships. In only one school type (secondary schools in the Public system) was there a difference in this response rate by sex - all female principals of these schools said this while only 78% of males did so (see Table 101).

Finally, principals' responses with respect to the question of the effect of sex on their relationships with fellow principals were almost completely identical to those for their relationships with Board Administration. That is, the majority of both males and females felt that their sex was not a factor which affected their relationships with fellow principals. Where sex was seen as a factor, male principals tended to see it as helping the relationship while females saw it as hindering the relationship (see Table 102). Again, the exception in this pattern was the female principals of secondary schools in the Public system, where all stated that their sex was not a factor.

The above patterns for this variety of questions related to the principals' assessment of the effect of sex on their relationships with different types of role partners show remarkable similarity. Basically, while the majority of principals felt that their sex does not enter into their professional relationships, women say this with greater frequency. Men tend more often than women to say that their sex is a source of help, while women tend, in greater proportions than men, to say that sex is a hindrance in professional relationships.

In conjunction with the above questions, we asked principals to comment on these and other ways in which they believed their sex had affected their roles as principals. Comments to this question were often lengthy and colourful,

TABLE 97: Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Teaching Staff in 5 Types of Schools

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Effect of Sex										
Not a factor	80.2	90.0	72.8	100.0	66.0	81.2	68.0	73.1	64.0	83.3
Helps Relationship	19.2	6.0	27.2	0.0	32.0	13.0	30.0	23.1	36.0	0.0
Hinders Relationship	0.5	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.9	5.8	2.0	3.8	0.0	0.0
Total number of Respondents	364	50	147	7	103	69	50	26	25	24

TABLE 98: Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Support Staff in 5 Types of Schools

Effect of Sex										
Not a factor	80.7	78.0	73.3	100.0	67.0	79.7	74.0	73.1	56.0	100.0
Helps Relationship	18.7	18.0	26.7	0.0	33.0	13.5	26.0	15.4	40.0	0.0
Hinders Relationship	0.6	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	0.0	11.5	4.0	0.0
Total number of Respondents	363	50	146	7	103	74	50	26	25	22

TABLE 99: Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Students in 5 Types of Schools

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Effect of Sex										
Not a factor	52.7	67.3	66.0	85.7	31.1	69.9	50.0	75.0	56.0	83.3
Helps Relationship	47.0	28.8	34.0	14.3	67.0	24.7	50.0	21.4	44.0	16.7
Hinders Relationship	0.3	3.8	0.0	0.0	1.9	5.5	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0
Total number of Respondents	366	52	147	7	106	73	50	28	25	24

TABLE 100: Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Parents and Community in 5 Types of Schools

Effect of Sex										
Not a factor	61.3	66.0	66.7	100.0	41.9	71.0	64.7	81.5	60.0	83.3
Helps Relationship	38.7	24.0	33.3	0.0	57.1	24.6	35.3	18.5	40.0	8.3
Hinders Relationship	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3
Total number of Respondents	364	50	147	7	105	69	51	27	25	24

TABLE 101: Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Board Administration in 5 Types of Schools

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Effect of Sex										
Not a factor	82.7	82.4	78.2	100.0	67.6	75.4	71.2	71.4	75.0	66.7
Helps Relationship	17.0	5.9	21.8	0.0	30.5	7.2	26.9	17.9	25.0	0.0
Hinders Relationship	0.3	11.8	0.0	0.0	1.9	17.4	1.9	10.7	0.0	33.3
Total number of Respondents	364	51	147	7	105	69	52	28	24	24

TABLE 102: Effect of Being Male or Female on Principals' Relationships With Fellow Principals in 5 Types of Schools

Effect of Sex										
Not a factor	71.6	71.2	71.4	100.0	64.8	68.1	76.5	67.9	76.0	70.8
Helps Relationship	28.4	7.7	28.6	0.0	35.2	9.7	23.5	21.4	24.0	8.3
Hinders Relationship	0.0	21.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	10.7	0.0	20.8
Total number of Respondents	366	52	147	7	105	72	51	28	25	24

indicating that, to many principals, this was an important question.

Many principals were insistent that their sex did not enter, as a source of influence, into any of these relationships:

> Irrelevant.
>
> A principal is a principal!
>
> The role is most affected by the nature of the person who holds the position.
>
> I believe that my sex has not been a factor. Since this is a "people" business, I must relate in a warm sincere fashion without a sexual bias.

However, some men admitted that such influences might exist without their being aware of them:

> How can I possibly know if my professional relationship with any of these groups would have been any different if I had been of the opposite sex? I am not aware that my sex is a factor in any of these relationships - but then again, no-one has ever said to me, "I am only doing this because you are a man!"
>
> The fact that I haven't considered it significant may reflect the male orientation of society.
>
> The large majority of principals in this area are male. Sex is less a factor to consider for a male in this situation than for a female. It is very much a subjective thing. I would say that most principals regard other principals as professionals rather than a male/female role.

Some male principals, on the other hand, commented about the different ways in which their sex had been a source of help in their performance of their role. Being male was seen as being generally helpful:

> By being male, I've not had to pre-occupy myself with becoming acceptable. It has been easier to be in the majority and part of the traditional male group.

> Being bold and male has never been a hindrance.
>
> I believe, rightly or wrongly, chauvinist or not, the image of decisive male leadership has contributed to my effectiveness as a principal.

Other men commented about more specific aspects of the helpfulness of their sex:

> Since the number of behavioural problems which come to me for counselling or discipline are predominately male students, I believe my being male is a definite asset particularly in counselling older students. From my experience as a principal, my observation is that male teachers (principals) react much less emotionally in crisis situations with parents (usually a mother).
>
> It probably assisted me in obtaining the position in the first place.
>
> I think the male stature in many ways inspires greater confidence from parents and demands a greater respect from pupils (non-chauvinistic observation, of course).
>
> I think people in general tend to prefer working for a male principal rather than female.
>
> Parents and students (Gr. 6-7-8 especially) seem to feel that a male principal will do a better job.

There were some women principals, on the other hand, who saw their sex as a source of difficulty in relating to certain groups:

> I sometimes think the present women's movements have hampered communication between sexes. I find I must always give a readiness period in an interaction in a group comprised mainly of men, to allow for the removal of any sense of threat. When I do speak, I try to have something that is worth hearing. I have this feeling in professional settings, but not in my relationships in the community. I am very comfortable on a low key informal basis with the mothers, the fathers, etc.

> Although in most instances it does not matter, there are some misogynists on staff and at times this has been difficult. On the other hand, I have been told any number of times that I have shown consideration and thoughtfulness which always seems to be attributed to my sex.
>
> 1) It seems to me and others that more and more women are being replaced by men principals. Male principals join men's organizations and share contacts with board members and administration that permits social and political contacts.
>
> 2) It is obvious that Administrators favour male principals in some respects, as in (1) above. Supportive improvements are made in schools with male principals.
>
> 3) Male principals are designated to attend certain conferences where rarely is this indicated to women principals - at least not with numerical equality.
>
> 4) Male principals are consulted and favoured (?) where generally female principals carry heaviest work loads - where this is comparable. Just a little more genuine concern would go a long way!
>
> 5) Replacements go, generally, to very young men, with minimum experience - (perhaps they are the only applicants). Because of their lack of experience, they are often lacking professional knowledge of the work to be done and ability in (even) administration.

However, some women commented that those difficulties were either lessening or had disappeared:

> I'm sure my sex has disconcerted people at times, but it becomes more acceptable every year. (Re students) - since it is probably very good for them to have a female "model." On occasion, ethnic boys have resented or have been rather amused at being "told off" by a female, but I've always been able to make my point. (Re fellow principals) - although my office holding may be token to a certain extent, I'm accepted with such good grace, that I really can't believe it is.

> Fellow principals have accepted me in the Principals' Association quite readily, and I feel no discrimination in regard to value placed on my opinions. I am given equal consideration for office. Administration expects the same performance from me as from male principals. I find it easy to relate to parents with understanding, am approached quite freely with concerns or for suggestions. Staff members appear to accept any necessary judgements I must make, though I always feel I must be extra well prepared to justify decisions which might not be generally accepted.

Nevertheless, these recent changes were often seen as signs of tokenism - a problem for principals of both sexes:

> I can't buy the fact that it is not a factor in relationships. From my experience, very few women make good administrators, and I'm upset at the "token" appointments of women in administration to appease the feminine movement. I have strong feelings here and not enough room to express them.
>
> Tokenism - "we must have representation from the women principals" (as if they are a breed apart). As a result, the woman principal is asked to serve on committees, hold office, carry out special requests, etc. more frequently than her male counterpart. The contribution, then, she is called upon to make, is not in proportion to the male principal - female principal ratio. Nevertheless, the woman principal in any precominately male group is still the first one looked to, to act as secretary or to serve the coffee.
>
> Really, the only drawback is that sometimes one or two female members (who happen to be strong women "libs") get the idea that women should be the only ones making decisions. Needless to say, they have to be reminded that men are sometimes capable of doing this. I have nothing against women liberators; I respect their views, but I do not like the "pushy" ones.

Community-Involving Activities in Schools With Male Vs. Female Principals

In accordance with the central emphasis of this study, a major portion of the principals' questionnaire explored different facets of community involvement in schools. We looked for possible differences in the ways that male vs. female principals had responded to many of these items. In this way, we were trying to find out whether or not the level of community involvement in schools varied according to the principal's sex.

In general, there are few significant differences although the overall pattern shows that schools with female principals have slightly lower levels of community involvement than do schools with male principals. However, this is true only in a limited sense, in relation only to particular types of community-related activities and only in some types of schools.

We found no differences in the number of weekly talks that male and female principals had with parents. Nor was there any difference in the relative frequency of parent volunteer programs in schools with male or female principals. Nor did the school's policy regarding a community orientation in the school curriculum vary according to the sex of the principal.

It was more unusual, however, for schools with female principals to have students go out into the community as part of their school work.[10] This was true in three of the five school types - Public elementary and secondary and Separate elementary schools (see Table 103).

Schools with male and female principals did not differ with respect to their involvement with school and community committees - operating either at the level of the school or at some more general level.

---

[10] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 2(d) of Chapter 4 (See Table 32).

Schools with female principals were somewhat less likely to have after-hours or weekend activities for children or youth[11] than were schools with male principals. This was true for all school types except Separate elementary (see Table 104). There was no such difference, however, with respect to similar activities offered for adults.

A general question regarding the overall question of community use of school facilities showed that schools with male and female principals had about the same level of use.

Finally, a number of questions were asked about community and parent participation in the making of school decisions.[12] Although the difference is limited to two of the school types in each case, relatively more schools with male principals than with female principals reported that parents and community members were involved ("a great deal" or "somewhat") in making each of three types of school decisions.

At the secondary level, schools with female principals were less likely to involve parents and community in decisions affecting school curriculum than were those with male principals (see Table 105). An identical pattern existed with respect to decisions regarding school rules and regulations (see Table 106). A somewhat different pattern existed with regard to community involvement in decisions affecting school philosophy. Here, in the case of secondary schools and in French-language schools where a woman, rather than a man, was principal, the community was less likely to be involved (see Table 107).

---

[11] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 2(b) of Chapter 4 (See Table 26).

[12] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 2(e) of Chapter 4 (See Table 36).

TABLE 103: Existence of Programs Involving Students Going Out Into the Community in 3 Types of Schools with Male and Female Principals

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Separate Elementary English Language	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
No such program	26.1	40.4	8.1	42.9	32.7	46.6
Some such program	63.9	59.6	91.9	57.1	67.3	53.4
Total number of respondents	356	47	149	7	101	73

TABLE 104: After-Hours Activities for Children/Youth in 4 Types of Schools with Male and Female Principals

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Some activities	85.3	66.0	94.2	85.7	60.4	78.6	100.0	87.5
No activities	14.7	34.0	5.8	14.3	39.6	21.4	0.0	12.5
Total number of respondents	375	53	154	7	53	28	25	24

TABLE 105: Sharing by Parents/Community in Decisions Affecting Curriculum in Secondary and R.C./Pr Schools with Male and Female Principals

	Public Secondary		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
"a great deal" and "quite a bit"	21.4	0.0	32.0	16.7
"somewhat" and "not at all"	78.6	100.0	68.0	83.3
Total number of respondents	154	7	25	24

TABLE 106: Sharing by Parents/Community in Decisions Affecting Rules and Regulations in Secondary and R.C./Pr. Schools with Male and Female Principals

	Public Secondary		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
"a great deal" and "quite a bit"	32.7	0.0	68.0	50.0
"somewhat" and "not at all"	67.3	100.0	32.0	50.0
Total number of respondents	153	6	25	24

Male and Female Principals' Involvement In, and Attitude Towards Community-Related Activities at School

We looked for possible differences by sex of principal in the responses to those items on the questionnaire which explored those aspects of the principal's role which relate to the community. We found that overall, female principals had somewhat lesser degrees of involvement in, and were somewhat less favourable to community-related activities than were male principals. It should be recalled that the female principals in our sample are somewhat older as a group than the male principals (see Table 76) and have somewhat less education (Table 77). It is probable that these different background characteristics account for some of the differences in orientation to the community.

When asked about their preferences regarding parent visits during the school hours,[13] male principals were more likely than females to say that parents should feel free to drop in at any time. Female principals, on the other hand, were more likely than the men to say that parents should first contact their office or wait until they are specifically invited. This was true for all school types (see Table 108).

When asked about their preferences regarding parent initiative in approaching the school,[14] relatively more male principals than female said that there was a need for the parents to take more initiative. Conversely, relatively more female principals said that parents were already taking the right amount, or even too much initiative (see Table 109).

Male and female principals did not differ in their degree of satisfaction with their communications with parents. Nor were there male-female differences in the degree of involvement principals had with parent-volunteer programs at their school. Schools with male principals were somewhat more likely to have programs which involved students going out into the community.

---

[13] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 3(f) of Chapter 4 (See Table 52).

[14] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 3(f) of Chapter 4 (See Table 53).

TABLE 107: Sharing by Parents/Community in Decisions Affecting School Philosophy in 2 Types of Schools with Male and Female Principals

	Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
"a great deal" & "quite a bit"	39.9	0.0	50.9	25.0
"somewhat" and "not at all"	60.1	100.0	49.1	75.0
Total number of respondents	153	7	53	28

TABLE 109: Male and Female Principals' Preferences Regarding Parent Initiave in Approaching Public Elementary Schools

	Public Elementary	
	Male %	Female %
Parents should take more Initiative	59.8	43.1
They take the right amount (or too much) initiative now	40.2	56.9
Total number of respondents	366	51

TABLE 108: Male and Female Principals' Preferences Regarding Parent Visits to 5 Types of Schools

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Should drop in anytime	46.9	36.5	44.0	28.6	48.0	41.8	38.8	23.1	52.0	20.8
Should first contact office or wait for invitation	53.7	63.5	56.0	71.4	52.0	58.2	61.2	76.9	48.0	79.2
Total number of respondents	367	52	150	7	100	79	49	26	25	24

Female principals appeared to be somewhat less involved than males in community-school committees.[15] This was limited, however, to only some school types. For community committees operating at the school level, male principals were more likely to be actively involved in organizing and coordinating the group's activities than were females. Conversely, females were more likely to just attend meetings, keep informed about the group's activities, or to have only occasional or no involvement with it. This difference, however, can only be seen clearly in Public and Separate elementary schools of English-language instruction (see Table 110).

Female principals were also less involved in community-school committees operating at a more general level than the single school. Here the difference was again restricted to two groups - Public elementary schools and R.C./Pr. schools (see Table 111).

Female principals were also less likely to be involved in the school's after-hours programs offered to children, youth, or adults,[16] than were male principals. In two school types - Separate elementary and R.C./Pr. - relatively fewer female than male principals indicated that they were actively involved in organizing or coordinating some of the activities (see Table 112). In all three types of elementary schools - Public, Separate, and French-language - there were relatively fewer female principals working as instructors or supervisors for some of the after-hours activities than there were male principals (see Table 113). Similarly, in three school types (secondary schools, Separate elementary schools and R.C./Pr. schools), female principals were less likely than males to be acting as resource persons to those who organized and supervised the after-hours activities (see Table 114).

---

[15] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 3(e) of Chapter 4 (See Table 46).

[16] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 3(e) of Chapter 4 (See Table 48).

TABLE 110: Male and Female Principals' Role in School Level Community Committees in 2 Types of Elementary Schools

	Public Elementary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Very actively involved	74.4	50.0	90.9	66.7
Peripherally involved	25.6	50.0	9.1	33.3
Total number of Respondents*	156	14	44	30

TABLE 111: Male and Female Principals' Role in General Level Community Committees for 2 Types of Schools

	Public Elementary		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Active Involvement	44.7	28.6	100.0	57.1
Peripheral or No Involvement	55.3	71.4	0.0	42.9
Total number of Respondents**	85	14	10	7

* Approximately two-thirds of these schools did not have school-level community committees.

** Approximately three-quarters of Public elementary schools and two-thirds of R.C./Pr. schools were not represented in general-level community committees.

TABLE 112: Active Involvement (Organizing/Coordinating) of After-Hours Programs for Children/Adults by Male and Female Principals in 2 Types of Schools

	Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Actively involved as Organizer	47.5	29.7	56.3	41.2
Not so involved	52.5	70.3	43.8	58.8
Total number of Respondents	59	37	16	17

TABLE 113: Male and Female Principals Active as Instructors or Supervisors in After-Hours Programs for Children/Adults in 3 Types of Elementary Schools

	Public Elementary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Involved as instructor/supervisor	22.0	3.2	32.0	17.1	52.2	41.7
Not so involved	78.0	96.8	68.0	82.9	47.8	58.3
Total number of respondents	223	31	50	35	23	12

TABLE 114: Male and Female Principals Active as Resource Persons for After-Hours Activities for Children/Adults in 3 Types of Schools

	Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Active as Resource person	55.7	0.0	64.2	51.3	85.7	63.2
Not so active	44.3	100.0	35.8	48.7	14.3	36.8
Total number of respondents	106	4	53	39	14	19

TABLE 115: Extra Demands Made on Male and Female Principals by Community Use of School Facilities in 4 Types of Schools

	Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
Extra demands made	71.5	50.0	51.2	38.5	65.8	47.6	69.6	60.0
No extra demands made	28.5	50.0	48.3	61.5	34.2	52.4	30.4	40.0
Total number of Respondents	151	6	86	65	38	21	23	20

TABLE 116: Male and Female Principals' Attitude to Community Use of School Facilities in 5 Types of Schools

	Public Elementary		Public Secondary		Sep. Elem. Eng. Language		Sep. Elem. Fr. Language		R.C./Pr.	
	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %	Male %	Female %
"very much" or "somewhat" in favour	66.5	42.9	68.2	42.9	61.5	40.0	83.0	69.2	56.5	23.8
"a little" or "not at all" in favour	33.5	57.1	31.8	57.1	38.5	60.0	17.0	30.8	43.5	76.2
Total number of Respondents	367	49	154	7	104	75	53	26	23	21

In light of the aforementioned, it is not surprising that male principals were more likely than female principals to note that community use of their school's facilities made extra demands on their time.[17] This was true in all school types except Public elementary (see Table 115).

Also, female principals were more likely than males to express reservations about the whole idea of community use of school facilities.[18] In all five school types, relatively more males said that they were "very much" or "somewhat" in favour of such community use, while relatively more females said they were only "slightly" or "not at all" in favour of such activities (see Table 116). A possible reason for the reservations of a number of female principals may be because they have not experienced, to any great degree, community use of their schools facilities.

However, when asked about the degree to which they favoured the general idea of community involvement in schools,[19] males and females responded similarly - most were in favour ("a great deal" or "somewhat"). We found no difference by sex, either, in principals' preferences for increasing the involvement of parents and community members in various types of school decision-making processes.

Summary of Findings

In terms of background characteristics of the principals, we found widespread male-female differences. Female principals were generally older than were males. They tended to have somewhat lower levels of educational achievement. Relatively fewer female than male principals had been vice-principals. Female principals in the Public system had spent relatively fewer years in this role than had males. This trend was reversed for principals in the Separate/Private system. Female principals, generally, had spent more years at their current schools than had males.

---

[17] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 3(e) of Chapter 4 (See Table 49).

[18] Basic findings for this item are found in Section 3(f) of Chapter 4 (See Table 54).

[19] Ibid.

With respect to the ways that principals divided their time among a variety of school tasks, we found very few male-female differences, and these tended to be limited to only one or two school types in each case. The same was true about the principals' preferred ways of spending their time. Nor did we find regular or wide-spread male-female differences in terms of what principals felt to be sources of constraint in performing their role.

Most principals did not feel that their sex influenced their professional relationships with a variety of role partners. However, women were even more likely to say this than were men. Proportionately more of the latter said that their sex had been a helpful factor in these relationships. While very few principals said that their sex had been a constraining factor in this repsect, women were much more likely to say this than were men.

Finally, female principals appeared to be somewhat less interested and involved in community-related activities than were male principals. Although this trend was limited to particular types of involvement and to principals in particular school types, the overall picture which emerged was that women principals were basically less involved with this area than were men. There were many areas of community-related activities where we found no male-female differences. It is significant, however, that when some differences existed, they always pointed in the same direction: male principals had more involvement in community-related activities and more such activities were offered through their schools. We found not a single area where this trend was reversed.

7

Summary of Findings

This chapter consists of three sections. The first, "Elements of School-Community Relationships," provides a review of the types and the nature of community-school interaction. From this description of the elements or factors which both affect and are affected by the principal's role, we proceed to summarize in the final two sections the findings regarding the principal's activities. The section, "The Principal's Role in the School as a Whole," contains the major findings regarding the principal's concerns and activities pertaining to the daytime or conventional school programs within the school building. The final section, "The Principal's Role in Relation to Community," presents the major findings regarding the principal's concerns and activities pertaining to the more general school-community exchanges. The implications of these findings will be discussed in Part III. The settings of the schools (size, types of students, nature of community) will not be included in this summary. This information is summarized on pages 37 and 38.*

The findings regarding each of the five school types has been summarized in Chapter 4 and will not be repeated here. Only when there are major and persistent differences among the types of schools will they be reported in this chapter.

Elements of School-Community Relationships

This study explored the nature and extent of most types of community-school relationships in Ontario schools.

---

* Summaries of each of the 5 school types can be found as follows:
Public elementary schools - pages 37, 69, 132, and 162.
secondary schools - pages 38, 71, 134, and 163.
Separate elementary schools (English) - pages 37, 72, 137, and 162.
Separate elementary schools (French) - pages 38, 74, and 159.
R.C./Pr. schools - pages 38, 75, and 142.

Nearly all schools appear to provide a variety of opportunities for parents, and the more general public, to learn about the school. Most send several newsletters to their students' homes each year. This is in addition to report cards. Most schools also hold some type of "open house" each year, and many hold several of these. Again, this is in addition to the usual parent-teacher interviews. Most schools stage one or more plays or concerts each year, and these are open to the general public. Most schools make some use of such community media as public television or the local newspaper. Principals in most schools talk with parents - in person or by telephone - at least once each day.

Nearly all schools make attempts, as well, to provide some local community emphasis in their curriculum. Most schools attempt to have some community concerns reflected in their courses - in about half of the schools, this is a school-wide policy. Students in all schools make field trips to the local community and in many cases, these are made quite frequently. The incidence of students doing course work in the community is quite high at the secondary level in the Public system (65%), although this happens only in a few of the elementary level schools (less than 10%) and in the R.C./Pr. schools (25%).

Nearly all schools make some use of local persons in order to enrich the school's program. Most have volunteer workers helping out on an occasional basis. This is especially frequent in elementary-level schools. The latter also make more use of community volunteers who come on a regular basis, such as daily or weekly. About one-third of secondary-level schools also do this. In addition, almost all schools have some visiting speakers talking with students in their classes or in larger assemblies. Secondary-level schools do this more frequently than do elementary-level ones.

The facilities of most schools are used in some way by their communities. Various kinds of after-hours activities for children and youth are offered in the majority of all types of schools. Similar activities for adults are offered through the facilities of about half of most schools and in nearly all secondary schools in the Public system.

A relatively small number of schools offer their facilities for a number of other types of community use. About 10% open their libraries for public use. Some, especially at the elementary level, also provide such special services as medical, dental, legal, or daycare.

Approximately one-quarter of schools, overall, participate in some type of neighbourhood improvement project. The most common type of project involves some sort of beautification program, such as the planting of trees.

Nearly half of all types of schools have some type of parent or community committee operating at the level of the school itself. At the elementary level, about half of these are P.T.A. or Home and School groups or other groups with a similar function. Principals' advisory groups are relatively more common at the secondary level than are P.T.A.-like groups. Principals in schools with some type of committee generally feel that the groups are functioning effectively. There are many principals (up to one-third in some types of schools) however, who state that their groups are only slightly or less effective. Some commonly mentioned problems of such school-community committees are lack of representation from the entire community, general community apathy, and an overly great reliance on the principal for direction.

About one-third of secondary-level schools and about one-fifth of elementary-level schools are represented, as well, on some type of community-school committee operating at a more general level than the school itself.

Principals state that in about one-quarter of the schools, parents and/or community members participate, to some degree, in decisions affecting the school's curriculum. In about one-half of the schools, overall, there is similar participation in decisions related to school rules and regulations and school philosophy.

Very few school principals (less than 3% overall) report having experienced any attempts by the community to gain control over some aspects of the school's operation. Many principals, however, state that they have heard of this happening elsewhere. About one-third of the principals feel that some type of control could happen in their school under some circumstances. In answer to the same question regarding possible community control, between one-third and one-half of the principals in different types of schools state that they feel this could not happen or that this is not a source of concern to them. About one-quarter say that they welcome greater levels of community involvement, regardless of possible implications for control.

Finally, nearly all principals state that their communities are interested in what goes on at the school. In about one-quarter of the cases, they feel that there is "a great deal" of such interest.*

There seems to be little difference between rural and urban schools with respect to the type and extent of their community-related activities.

There are certain differences between schools with female principals and those with male principals. Schools with female as opposed to male principals appear to have somewhat lower levels of some types of community-school exchanges (e.g. having programs involving students going out into the community, parental/community involvement in school decisions). However, differences are not consistent across all school types and are usually restricted to only some of the school types, and there are some elements of community-school relations where no such differences exist (e.g. school policy regarding community-oriented curriculum, frequency of parent volunteer programs, personal involvement with school and community committees, community use of facilities).

---

* It is somehow ironic that principals see parental and in general community apathy as one of the causes of community school programs and exchanges being less than successful. One possible explanation for this seeming contradiction may be that while parents are indeed interested, they do not have time, or do not see these programs as a priority, or are uncertain of the exact procedures to become actively and regularly involved.

The Principal's Role in the School as a Whole

Principals were asked to describe the relative amounts of time they spent on a variety of school-related tasks. About 60% indicate they spend a considerable amount of time on administrative activities. Approximately one-half say they spend much time on each of curriculum-related tasks and teaching-staff supervision and evaluation. The same is true for about one-third of the principals in relation to student-related tasks, and for about one-quarter in relation to support-staff supervision. Only about one-fifth of the principals say they spend much time teaching in the classroom or participating in professional activities outside of the school. Relatively fewer principals indicate they spend much time on community-related activities than for any other task (about 15% do).

Principals' ideal ways of allocating their school time differ considerably from their current situation. The area of greatest discrepancy appears to be that of administrative tasks - only one-tenth of the principals are interested in spending much time in this area. Also, somewhat fewer principals want to spend much time on professional activities (10%) than now do. There is no difference in the actual and ideal proportions of principals who want to spend time teaching in the classroom. For all other task areas, however, more principals want to have considerable amounts of time than they do currently. Proportions of principals who, ideally, would like to spend much time on different tasks are as follows: 75% on curriculum-related tasks; 70% on staff supervision and evaluation; about 50% on each of student-related tasks and support-staff related tasks; and about 25% on community-related tasks.

Commonly mentioned persons who could take over the less desired parts of the principal's role include secretaries, vice-principals, and administrative assistants.

When asked about factors which constrain them in the performance of their jobs, most principals (80%) mentioned the factors of time and budget. Slightly over half mention the problems of school space and equipment and of formal administrative procedures. About one-third note difficulties with their Board of Education, while one-fifth of elementary- and two-fifths of secondary-level school principals mention the Ministry of Education as sources of constraint. Other areas of constraint (mentioned by fewer than one-quarter of the principals overall) include conflicts with teaching staff, with teachers' federations, with support staff, with students, and with parents and community.

When asked about what they feel are the greatest problems of today's principal, about one-third of the respondents mentioned the inadequacy of such resources as time, money and help. Conflicts with staff members are mentioned by about one-fifth of principals in elementary level schools and by about one-third of those in secondary level schools. The increased societal demands placed on the educational system are mentioned as a central problem by about one-quarter of elementary-level and by about 10% of secondary-level principals. Conflict of expectations from different groups is mentioned as a main problem of the principalship by about one-quarter of the respondents.

Other problems, mentioned by fewer than one-fifth of the respondents overall, include the rapidity of educational change, lack of guidance for the principal, the loss of the principal's autonomy, the impersonality of today's larger schools and administrative units, the difficulty of keeping a high level of morale in the school, public relations, and the declining morality of society as a whole.

We did not look for possible urban-rural differences in the ways that principals fulfilled their overall roles in the school as a whole.

In terms of male-female differences, we found very few and very limited relationships in terms of their in-the-school role. Male and female principals do not appear to differ significantly in the way they divide their time among various school tasks or in what they perceive to be constraining or problematic factors regarding their role.

The Principal's Role in Relation to Community

Whatever types of community-related activities may be happening in a particular school, chances are that the principal will be actively involved in these activities.

Two-thirds or more of the principals, in all types of schools with parent volunteer programs, are strongly supportive of and involved in community-related activities. Three-quarters of the principals of schools with some type of program requiring students to work in the community are similarly involved in these activities. In schools with school-level community school committees, nearly all principals are active in organizing and coordinating the activities of the group, or at least they attend most meetings. The same is true of about two-thirds of the principals of schools which are represented on community-school committees operating at a more general level than the school itself.

Despite the fact that other agencies besides the school are usually involved in the offering, within the school facility, of after-hours activities for both children and adults, the school principal is nevertheless quite actively involved in these activities. About one-half of principals in schools which offer such activities are active in their organization and coordination. Many are also acting as instructors or supervisors in these programs. Over half say that they act as resource persons to others who do the supervising or organizing for the programs. Many indicate still other types of involvement.

In view of the above facts, it is understandable that about 40% of elementary-level and about 60% of secondary-level school principals indicate that community use of their school's facilities makes extra demands on their time. Also, about half of all principals say that they themselves have the single greatest responsibility for community-related activities at their school. Other individuals such as vice-principals or community-school coordinators are mentioned very infrequently as taking on this role.

It is understandable, as well, that about 40% of elementary-level and 55% of secondary-level school principals indicate they would like to have more time to spend on community-related activities than they currently do.

Nearly all principals are in favour of at least somewhat increased levels of community use of school facilities. Also, about 80% of principals, overall, are in favour of increased community involvement at their school.

Principals generally feel that their School Boards, as well as the Ministry of Education, are similarly favourable to increased community involvement. However, only about half of the principals feel that the students, staff and parents of their school share this attitude. Even fewer principals think that their teachers' federation affiliate is in favour of increased levels of community involvement.

By far the most commonly mentioned barrier to such involvement is the factor of parental and community indifference and apathy. About one-third of all respondents note this as a barrier. Up to 20% of respondents note, as well, that parents' previous commitments prevent their participation.

Other commonly mentioned barriers to this development include financial difficulties (about 20%), staff reluctance (15%), and distance (both social and physical) between school and community (about 15%). Still other barriers to community involvement, mentioned by 10% or fewer respondents in each case, include inadequate facilities, lack of official support, vandalism, and lack of time.

Factors which principals commonly mention as possible sources of support for this type of development include (in descending order): extra time or help, extra funding and community support. Other factors mentioned by 10% or fewer principals in each case include a community-school coordinator, official endorsement of the concept, extra support staff, more suitable programming, improved facilities, and better communication with the community.

Skills or resources which the principals themselves would like to have in order to develop more in the direction of greater community involvement are of both "personal" and "system" types. On the "personal" side, about one-third of principals say they would like to develop better interpersonal skills in relation to adults, while a similar proportion indicate they wish to improve their own understanding of the entire concept of community schools. "System" resources, which principals indicate would be helpful, include more money and other resources, more time, and more or better qualified staff. Between 10% and 20% of principals mention each of these three types of "system" resources.

When asked who should help them develop in this direction, the majority of principals name their own School Board, while about one-third mention the Ministry of Education.

About one-half of all principals indicate that they have participated in recent conferences where community involvement in school was a central topic. However, only about one-quarter of these principals say that these conferences were "very worthwhile" and about one-third indicate they were "somewhat worthwhile."

In terms of urban-rural differences in the above findings, there appears to be a slight tendency, in some school types only, for principals in rural schools to be somewhat more favourable to community involvement in school than for those in urban schools.

Finally, as we have pointed out, there appears to be a definite tendency for female principals to be somewhat less involved in community-related activities in their school than are male principals. However, this difference exists only in relation to some areas (e.g. parental/community involvement in decision making, informality of parent visits, acting as resource persons for after-school adult/youth activities), while in other areas male and female principals are equally involved (e.g. community use of facilities).

We now turn to the second part of the study, in which we examine findings from the Community School Survey of 271 schools in Ontario which claimed to be "community schools," and present three brief case studies.

Part II Community Schools

8 Introduction to Part II

During the spring of 1974, the researchers conducted two small exploratory surveys of Ontario community schools.[1] This earlier research provided the background for the present survey. Additional areas for exploration were suggested both directly through the surveys and indirectly through the large number of community school contacts which we had made. As a result of these inputs, we became increasingly aware of specific areas of difficulty in the operation of community schools and of the need for a sound data base on which future planning could most successfully be grounded.

During the first year we had also carried out a thorough search of the literature related to community schools. The resulting bibliography[2] included a great many items of a documentary or "opinion" nature. There was, however, a nearly complete absence of quantitative empirical research in the area of community schools.

It was the researchers' understanding that their exploratory surveys were the first studies of this kind, and certainly so within the province of Ontario. Accordingly, our initial questionnaire was designed without reference to previous related research. It had been our intent to improve and refine the questionnaire through these smaller surveys in preparation for the larger study which is the subject of this report.

---

[1] Clifford et al., Community Schools Survey, September, 1974, 18pp.

[2] Clifford et al., Bibliography: Community School Literature: 1972-1974, September, 1974, 42pp.

It should be noted that the first survey was very small in scope. It was restricted geographically to the vicinity of the southeast part of the Province where the research office was located. Contact persons on four area Boards of Education were approached and asked to name some "community schools" in their Board's jurisdiction. The resulting twenty-five schools were mailed a copy of a questionnaire which asked about their history, activities, organization, staffing, funding, and other related factors. Over 80% of the schools returned completed questionnaires.

From the information gained in this survey, the questionnaire was revised. Ambiguities were clarified and some new questions were added.

The second survey was intended to be more representative of the province than the first one had been. Accordingly, contact persons on eleven different Boards of Education and at the Ministry of Education were sought out. Again, they were asked to name "one or two community schools" in their areas. This term was purposely left undefined so that we would not influence the selection with our pre-existing ideas about community schools. Although the resulting forty community schools were located in many different parts of the province, no attempt had been made to represent all parts systematically. The revised community school questionnaire was mailed to these schools and once again, a response rate of over 80% was achieved.

From the combined data of these two exploratory surveys we were able to begin to describe the community school movement in the province.

The trend appeared to be a recent but growing one. Most of our schools had begun to operate as community schools only during the present decade. Most of them had been initiated by the work of interested principals and in some cases, by members of school boards.

The great majority of the schools had used community surveys in order to determine what programs to offer. The actual programs ranged over a great variety of activities. Most of these schools opened their facilities to the community. After-hours recreational and educational programs for both children and adults were very common. Many schools had daytime volunteer programs. A few offered medical, dental, and social services within the school building.

Over half of the schools had some type of formal organization, such as a community school council, to organize and operate the overall program. These councils were generally quite recently formed. About a third of the schools also had a paid community school coordinator, usually working full-time at the school.

Staffing for particular programs was obtained about equally from volunteers and from part-time salaried workers. The school's daytime staff tended also to be quite active in the after-hours programs, sometimes receiving extra remuneration and sometimes not. It was indicated that while the Principal and Vice-principal were often involved in after-school activities, they were not, as a rule, remunerated for their services. On the other hand, slightly over a quarter of the community schools' teaching staff did receive extra pay for "work beyond the usual school day." Just less than half of the respondents cited the custodial staff as being active after school hours in the community school and the great majority indicated that the custodians were paid for their work.

Most schools reported that in addition to salary allowances, extra expenses were incurred because of the community school. These were primarily for operating or maintenance purposes. Funding for these extra needs was generally obtained from participant fees and from Board of Education grants. Other common sources of funding included the holding of sales and drives. Government grants (municipal, provincial, and federal) were also obtained by a number of schools.

When evaluating the overall effectiveness of their programs, respondents (usually the school Principal) were generally positive. Although many problem areas were mentioned, the way ahead tended to be seen as one of growth and expansion.

Although these exploratory surveys answered some questions about the nature of the community school movement in Ontario, they raised many more. The need for a fully comprehensive, representative study became more and more apparent. We felt that community school people everywhere would benefit from seeing their problems and achievements in the perspective of the broader movement, which appeared to be a growing one. Many community schools seemed to be very isolated. Fresh ideas for possible new programs, fresh solutions to common problems, new approaches to the future could all be gained by the collecting and disseminating of such information.

For the province-wide survey we designed a much larger, more comprehensive questionnaire (Appendix C). It was based, to a degree, on the previous ones, but was intended to gain information about many additional topics. Some of these broad questions are listed below:

-What are community schools doing?
-How extensive are the different types of community involvement?
-Who participates?
-What forces create community schools?
-What factors contribute to their successes?
-What forces impede them?
-What sorts of "outreach" techniques are used and which are most effective?
-What is the role of community school coordinators?
-What is the role of community school councils?
-Who staffs the programs?
-How are they funded?
-Is there a relationship between vandalism and "open" schools?
-How, if at all, do these questions depend on such factors as school size, school type (elementary versus secondary), and the type of community that is served by the school?

We tried to identify schools which were attempting to bring together the resources and interests of the neighbouring community with those of the school. This might involve the use of the school's recreational and educational facilities by the community, their actual input into and assistance in the daytime program and/or the involvement of the school in aspects of community outreach or development activities. Some or all of these activities were happening in the schools which we studied. We were interested as well in finding out about schools where the community had had some specific role in operating or making decisions about the community school.

Community schools to be included in our Province-wide surveys were identified by Directors of Boards of Education. All schools named in this way (over 300) were mailed a questionnaire which dealt with various aspects of community schools. A total of 271 of these schools returned completed questionnaires. The survey approach enabled us to gain a very broad and general perspective of the community school movement in the Province as a whole.

To supplement the quantitative data gathered from this large number of schools, we selected, as well, three schools that were examined in much more detail. These case studies illustrate issues and concerns facing community schools that are located in very different settings.

Data collected using these two very different methodologies (survey and case-study approach) form the bases for the sections of this report which follow. Chapter 9, which describes the Province-wide survey, is divided into sections dealing with the methodology used and our detailed findings about different aspects of community involvement. After a discussion of how the data were collected and analysed, Chapter 10 presents the findings following the general format of the community schools questionnaire: basic characteristics, history, activities, organization, staffing, funding, and issues. Chapter 11 is an account of the community school programs that have been developed at three schools located in Ontario. These schools each represent a different community locale - Suburban Elementary, Rural Elementary, and Urban Secondary.

9 Methodology for Part II

Since one of our aims was to document the community school movement as it was taking place in all areas of Ontario, it was decided that all Boards of Education would be approached and asked to identify some of their community schools for our sample.

A letter addressed to the Directors of Boards of Education was mailed to 110 boards on March 12th, 1975. The letter explained the background of our related research, defined the concept of community school, and asked the Director or his representative to name some such schools in his area. It was stressed that no schools need be named if, in their opinion, none fit the definition. A sample copy of our questionnaire was included along with the letters, as was a prepaid self-addressed return envelope. The letter asked for the names and addresses of the schools and for the name of the Principal or other individual in charge of the community school.

The letter to Directors indicated that the survey would be conducted "some time in April." By the beginning of April only about one-quarter of the Boards had responded to our request. It became necessary, therefore, that we "remind" those Directors who had not yet replied. Also, we became aware that some Boards, particularly the large urban ones, would have to refer our request to a research committee which might not meet for some time. It was decided, therefore, that we would begin mailing our questionnaires to those schools which had been identified and then continue mailing to new schools as their names were given to us. This was seen as preferable to our original plan which would have postponed the mailing of the survey until all replies from Directors had been received.

Accordingly, we mailed out the first set of questionnaires to 101 schools on April 4th. The envelopes were addressed to the Principals of the community schools or to any other person named by the Directors. The covering page of the questionnaire (see Appendix C) explained the nature and purpose of the study. A self-addressed, pre-paid envelope was included along with each questionnaire.

At the same time, we began to telephone those Directors across the province whose replies we had not yet received. A few of these phone calls resulted in the further identification of community schools. Many others, however, yielded the information that there was no community school in the area. In fact, the telephone reminders proved to be so ineffective a way extending our sample, as well as taking considerable time and expense, that we decided to terminate them even though one-third of the Boards had not replied or been reached by telephone.

As the completed questionnaires began to come back to us, we became aware that in a few cases, Directors had forwarded their sample courtesy copy of our questionnaire to a community school where the Principal then completed it and returned it to us directly. Some Directors even duplicated the questionnaire and sent the copies on to several schools.

Directors' replies continued to come in until we closed our search at the end of May. By this time 55 schools boards - or one-half of all boards in the province - had contributed some community schools to our sample. Their naming of these schools had been done through letters, over the telephone and, in a few cases, by directly mailing our questionnaires to their schools. As each reply from a Director came in, a thank-you letter was mailed out to the respondent.

An additional 18 Boards (16.4%) had been contacted and replied by letter or by telephone that no community schools existed in their areas. We had been successful in communicating with an additional 37 Boards (33.6%). However, it is our impression that Board representatives who did not reply by letter tended generally to feel that they had no community schools. Accordingly, we could predict that those Directors whom we were unable to contact by telephone would have made few contributions to our sample.

As Directors' replies were coming in, we were mailing questionnaires to the schools that they named. The mailing took place several times each week until the end of May. At this time, a total of 336 schools had been named and mailed questionnaires.

The response rate of the questionnaires was quite high from the beginning. Nevertheless, we found it necessary to send reminder notes to a number of the schools. These were always mailed two weeks after the initial mailing.

The survey was closed at the beginning of July. By this time, 271 community schools or 81% of our sample had returned completed questionnaires. This high response rate was comparable to that which we had achieved in our previous exploratory survey. However, this high return rate from such a large sample spread over the entire province of Ontario was even more encouraging. We feel quite certain that our data are comprehensive and representative of the community school movement in the province.

Figure 3: Summary of Sampling Procedures

March 12	- letter mailed to 110 Directors
Mid March to End of May	- replies received from 73 Boards (66.4%) - 18 of these (16.4% of all Boards) reply they have no community schools - 55 of these (50% of all Boards) name 336 schools
June	- questionnaires are mailed to these schools and 271 or 81% return them completed.

When the survey was closed, the data were coded. Since many of the questions in the questionnaire had been open-ended, a rather long and detailed system of coding was developed in order to look at the data. Three different coders worked on the coding although most of it was done by one person who was very experienced with coding procedures. A 10% check of the coding was performed independently for each coder. One coder, less experienced than the others, was found to have an error rate of 3.8%. All of this coder's work, accordingly, was checked for errors. The rest of the coding had an error rate of 1.2%. All errors found were corrected.

When the coding and coding check were completed, the data were transferred to computer cards for purposes of analysis.

Our approach in looking at our survey results will be primarily descriptive. In other words, we will discuss numbers and/or percentages of community schools which responded in a given way to the questions in our survey.

In general, we will be looking at the way all of the 271 schools in our sample responded to each particular question. At other times, however, we will want to examine whether or not some special characteristics may have influenced the response rate. These characteristics of community schools have been designated as "independent variables" because we have reason to believe they may have important relationships with what is going on at the school ("dependent variables").

Although one could reason that a great many different factors have predisposing properties in this area of community schools, we have selected three basic independent variables for the present study. These three characteristics - school type, type of community served by school and length of time of operation as a community school - appear, of all our variables, as the most likely ones to have a bearing on whatever trends we may find.

In order to present our findings in a simple and easily understood form, our independent variables will be dichotomous. That is, we will talk about the ways that "new" schools may differ from "old," or urban schools differ from rural, or elementary schools differ from secondary. The exact definition of these terms appears below. These definitions should be kept in mind in order to fully understand the text and tables in the chapter on findings.

School Type

Elementary schools - public, junior high, senior public schools or grades K-6, K-8, 7-8, 9 (217 schools*)

Secondary schools - levels 1-5 or grades 9-13, or some combination of these with grades 7-8 (40 schools*)

Type of Community Served by School

Rural schools - rural, village, town of less than 25,000 (170 schools*)

Urban schools - town over 25,000 - to large city (115 schools*)

Length of Time as Community School

New community schools - established in 1971 or since (128 schools*)

Old community schools - established prior to 1971 (102 schools*)

Throughout the description of results, tables will be used to illustrate the effects of these independent variables on our dependent variables.

Direct quotations from questionnaires will be used throughout the report in order to illustrate findings. These quotations originate with the persons filling out the questionnaires - usually the school Principal (84%), and sometimes a community school worker (8%), Vice-principal (4%), or other individual (4%). (Table 117)

For the cross-tabulations (i.e. how one variable affects a second one), we used the X^2 (Chi Square) test of significance at a minimum of .05 level of significance.

---

*Note: The number of schools in these subcategories does not add up to the total number of 271 community schools in our sample because of missing information, uncodable responses, and, in the case of "type of community," several responses given by a number of schools. In the latter instance, for example, schools indicating that they served rural as well as urban communities were included in both the rural and urban school categories.

Table 117: Position of Person Completing Questionnai-es

n = 257*

	Number	Percent
Principal	216	84.0
Community School Worker	21	8.2
Vice-Principal	11	4.3
Community Association Member	1	0.4
Other	8	3.1

---

[*] In the tables which follow, "n" represents the number of schools responding to a particular item. The total number of schools in the study was 271, but the "n" varies from table to table, because of varying non-response rates or non-applicable items. Non-response rates are indicated only in those instances where they exceed 15%. Percentages given are for a particular table are calculated using the "n" of that table as a base.

In Tables 14, 15, 16, 28, 41 and 42, we make specific comparisons between different types of schools. The statistical measure Chi Square (X^2) has been used to determine whether these relationships are significant.

10 Survey Findings

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

As we have indicated, the community schools included in this survey have been selected from all parts of the province of Ontario. Both Public and Separate School Boards were included.

One half of the province's Boards of Education have one or more community schools in our sample. There are schools from large urban centres as well as from small village communities. There are small schools and large ones. There are schools representing all grade levels from Kindergarten to Grade 13. About one-third of the schools in our survey (30%) are in Roman Catholic Separate School Boards. In short, the survey data appears to be widely representative of Ontario community schools today.

Although all types of schools are included in our sample, they are not necessarily included to the same extent. Our data show, for example, that smaller schools are more likely to have been named as community schools. Nearly two-thirds of the schools in our survey had fewer than 500 pupils. Three quarters had fewer than 30 full-time teachers and among these, it was more likely than not that there would be fewer than fifteen teachers. (Table 118)

The community schools were more likely to be elementary schools than secondary. 80% of the schools in our sample included grades from Kindergarten up to Grade 11. Slightly fewer than half of these only went up to Grade 6. Only about 15% of the schools in our sample were secondary schools. However, this proportion is approximately the same as the total percentage of secondary schools in the province as a whole. (Table 119)

Community schools were as likely to be located in rural communities and small towns as in the larger urban centres. Over one-third of our schools said they were situated in rural or village communities while an additional quarter were in towns of less than 25,000 population. On the other hand, 40% of the schools said they were located in large cities of 60,000 or more people. About half of these schools were in the suburban areas, while the other half were in the down-town cores of these cities. (Table 120)

Table 118: School Size

n = 258

Number of full-time students	Number	Percent
Up to 250	54	21.0
251 - 500	114	44.2
501 - 750	43	16.7
751 - 1000	22	8.5
More than 1000	25	9.7

n = 259

Number of full-time teachers	Number	Percent
Up to 15	110	42.5
16 - 30	92	35.5
31 - 45	25	9.7
46 - 60	10	3.9
61 - 75	9	3.5
76 - 90	9	3.5
Over 91	4	1.5

Table 119: School Type

n = 257

	Number	Percent
Public (K - 6)	93	36.2
Junior high / Senior public	16	6.2
Secondary school (9 - 13)	36	14.0
Public and senior public combined	108	42.0
Junior high and secondary combined	4	1.6

Table 120: Type of Community Served by School

n = 271

	Number	Percent
Rural / village	121	45.0
Town - 25,000 or less	64	23.6
Town - up to 60,000	20	7.4
City suburbs - over 60,000	50	18.5
City downtown - over 60,000	53	19.6

(note: There may be more than 100.0% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

HISTORY

In investigating the history of community activities at the schools in our survey, we were interested not only in how long activities had been going on, but also in specific factors concerning the initiation of these activities. We asked what the major impetus for the introduction of the idea of community involvement had been for each school and also who had played a major role in setting up the activities. Many respondents gave similar answers to both of these items; for example, several schools listed the Principal of the school as both a major impetus for the introduction of the community idea and as a person playing a major role in the initiation of activities. We also inquired about whether visits to other community programs might have taken place and if so, who had made the visits. Finally, we asked about goals - what were the initial goals or objectives? How had they changed, if at all, since initiation of activities? How effective had the schools been to this point in reaching their initial goals?

Results from the item concerning how long community programs had been in effect show that activities at most schools in our survey began relatively recently. Over half (56%) of our schools had initiated activities within the past 5 years - since 1971. Indeed, more schools had begun activities in the past year (1974-1975) than in any other single year. Although a majority of schools had had continuous activities for less than 5 years, it is intersting to note that more schools began activities in 1970 (16%) than in any other year, except 1974-1975. This figure is just slightly less than that of the combined total for the three years from 1967 to 1970. (Table 121)

Table 121: Year of Commencement of Community School Activities

n = 230

no response rate (NR) = 15%

	Number	Percent
1974/75	48	20.9
1973	20	8.7
1972	31	13.4
1971	29	12.6
1970	36	15.7
1969	21	9.1
1968	8	3.5
1967	8	3.5
Before 1967	29	12.6

Table 122: Major Impetus for Introduction of Notion of Community School

n = 245

	Number	Percent
Principal	40	16.3
Board of Education	28	11.4
Expressed need by community	136	55.5
Need for closer identification of school and community	66	26.9
School desire for community resources	50	20.4
Government grants / encouragement	16	6.5
Other	14	5.7

(Note: There may be more than 100.0% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

As mentioned above, the Principal appears to be an important person with respect to community school programs. Over two-thirds (70%) of our respondents listed the Principal as playing a major role in setting up the community school. In addition, the Principal was described as a major impetus for the introduction of the idea of community activity at their schools in over 15% of the cases. (Table 122)

The single factor mentioned most often, however, as a major force for the introduction of the idea of community school activities was the community itself. Over one-half of the schools in our survey (56%) indicated that the need of the community for school facilities and/or resources was important. For instance, one person wrote that:

> [A major impetus was] the idea of giving the grade 7 and 8 students something to keep them off the streets and giving them some worthwhile recreation.

Other important factors were the school's desire for closer identification with the community (27%) and its wish to make use of community resources (20%). These ideas were indicated by such comments as:

> [A major impetus was] to promote a sense of pride and ownership in the school.
>
> [A major impetus was that] our volunteer program was not growing like it should.

Only 7% reported that the availability of government funding was a major factor. (Table 122)

The influence of the community itself is further documented by our results, which show that just over half (52%) of our respondents listed parents and/or community members as playing a major role in the initiation of activities. Only the Principal was mentioned more often (see above). Other important people were staff members (36%), and, to a lesser degree, Board members (11%). One comment designated "the entire staff of 4" as persons playing a major role. Community school workers were rarely cited as initiators. This is probably because they tend to be appointed after the community school is already well established. An additional 3% of the respondents said that students had been initiators:

> [Persons playing a major role were] three local adolescents who really took charge and who are responsible to a large extent for the program and its success to date.

(Table 123)

It is interesting to note that only about one-quarter (27%) of the schools in this survey reported that they had visited other community school programs. Those who had made visits appear to have gone appreciable distances in order to do so. Many (50%) reported that they went outside their own boards, and nearly one-quarter (24%) reported trips outside Canada. Many of the visitors going outside Canada had Flint, Michigan as their destination. However, one-half (50%) of those who had made visits mentioned having visited schools within their own boards. Most frequent visitors to other schools were parents or community members (43%) and Principals (43%). Staff members were sometimes mentioned (23%) but others, such as community school workers, Board members, and students, were mentioned relatively infrequently (8%, 3%, and 3% respectively). (Table 124a, b, c)

Table 123: Persons Playing Major Role in Setting Up of Community School

n = 220

NR = 19%

	Number	Percent
Principal	154	70.0
Parents / Community members	115	52.3
Staff members	79	36.0
Board of Education / Trustees	25	11.4
Students	6	2.7
Community School Worker	18	8.2
Other	20	9.1

(Note: There may be more than 100.0% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 124a: Visits to Other Community Schools

n = 235

	Number	Percent
Visits were made to other schools	72	30.6*

*(26.6% of total sample)

Table 124b: Who was involved in these visits?

n = 40

	Number	Percent
Principal	17	42.5
Parents	17	42.5
Staff	9	22.5
Board	1	2.5
Students	1	2.5
Community School Worker	3	7.5
Names (no title given)	4	10.0

Table 124c: Where were the schools they visited?

n = 70

	Number	Percent
Inside own Board	35	50.0
Outside own Board - in Ontario	35	50.0
Outside Ontario - in Canada	5	7.1
Outside Canada	17	24.3
General, non-specific response	4	5.7

(Note: There may be more than 100.0% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Questions concerning goals yielded a variety of responses, from the particular:

> [Initial goals were to] provide parents with an opportunity to "roll up their pant cuffs and get their feet wet" in education.

to the general:

> Attempt to keep the school in the role of being a viable, vibrant influential entity in the life of the community.

However, in spite of this variety, and although the schools in our survey were highly diverse (e.g. size, grade level, age and extent of community school activities, location, and religious affiliation), their initial goals and objectives tended to fall into one or more of five main areas of concern. There were: (1) satisfy community needs, (2) improve communication, (3) become part of community, (4) maximize or improve use of school facilities, and (5) tap the resources of the community. (Table 125)

The most commonly mentioned goal, a primary concern for nearly half of our sample (49%), was that of satisfying community needs:

> To provide programs of interest to community; to develop a sense of community; and to enable people, especially women, to feel a part of something more encompassing than the walls of their house.

Given that a major motivation for many in initiating activities was to meet community needs, this result is not surprising. Other common objectives were to improve communication and school-community relations (34%) and to become a more integral part of the community (31%):

> Our "goals" were not goals to develop a community school so much as to put the school back in the community.
>
> To create an atmosphere of openness and acceptance that will promote a healthy interaction between school and community.

About one-quarter (24%) mentioned maximizing or improving the use of school facilities:

> To provide a greater opportunity for the community to utilize a valuable resource that was idle for long periods.

Interestingly, although over 80% of the schools in our survey reported making at least occasional use of volunteers and nearly two-thirds (60%) made regular use of volunteers in the classroom (Table 128), less than a quarter (23%) mentioned tapping the resources of the community for the regular school program as an initial objective. (Table 125)

Just over a quarter (28%) of the schools in our survey indicated that their goals had changed much over time. This may well be due to the relatively recent initiation of many of the programs. (Table 126)

Of those that did not indicate 'no change' or 'more of the same,' more involvement of the community in the affairs and activities of the school was mentioned frequently.

> We are presently reaching many people, however, it is hoped to reach those people who do not have children attending our school.

Other goals changes were mentioned only rarely. These most typically had to do with more emphasis on involvement of the school in the affairs of the community or on open communication between the school and the community. (Table 126)

Table 125: Initial Goals and Objectives

n = 271

	Number	Percent
Tapping community resources	63	23.2
Satisfying community needs	133	49.1
Maximizing / improving use of facilities	66	24.4
Bettering communication	92	33.9
Becoming part of the community	85	31.4

(Note: There may be more than 100.0% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 126: Changes in Goals Over Time

n = 185

NR = 32%

	Number	Percent
No change	110	59.5
Some non-specific change	41	22.2
More involvement of community in school	26	14.1
More involvement of school in community	8	4.3
Improved communication	8	4.3
Other	1	0.5

(Non-response rate - 32%)

(Note: There may be more than 100.0% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

In assessing how effective they had been in meeting goals, most schools indicated optimism and success:

> Demands by the community to use the school have been terrific.

Almost two-thirds of respondents (63%) reported that they had met most or all goals:

> Our school is a happy, busy focal point in this area.

Another quarter (24%) indicated partial effectiveness, having met some goals. Only a small group (6%) stated that they had met few or no goals. (Table 127)

Table 127: Assessment of Effectiveness in Meeting Goals

n = 202

NR = 25%

	Number	Percent
Undetermined / variable	14	6.9
Effective / met all goals	55	27.2
Satisfactory / met most goals	73	36.1
Partially effective / met some goals	48	23.8
Ineffective / met few or no goals	12	5.9

(Non-response rate - 25%)

Throughout this portion of the survey, many people indicated that they had difficulty in deciding what the title "community school" indicated. Although many had fairly extensive community-oriented programs, they often hesitated to label themselves "community schools":

> Our goals were not so much to develop a community school so much as to put the school back in the community.
>
> I would not class our school as a community school; it is just an ordinary average school which has tried to keep the school in the community by keeping the community in the school, with special programs and just plain interest in the children and their activities.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Community schools in our survey engaged in a wide variety of activities involving parents, other community members, daytime staff, and students. There were activities all around the clock, and the calendar. We have classified the types of programs into eight general categories. Each of these will be described below.

Parent and Community Volunteers

Schools in our sample reported that they had volunteer programs of various types. Some types were quite common and were mentioned by many respondents, while other occurred in only a few schools. (Table 128)

One common use of volunteer assistance, reported by 61% of the schools in our survey, was for help in the classroom. The largest percentage of these schools (70%) reported having fewer than 10 people helping out in this way. Just under 20% reported having between 11 and 30 people. Very few (4%) had more than 30 people working in the classrooms.

Over half of the schools (54%) also used volunteer help in their libraries or resource centres. More than three-quarters of these schools had 5 people, or fewer, in this area. Another 20 schools (14%) reported 6-10 helpers. Very few schools, less than 4% of those with library help, had more than 10 volunteer workers in this area.

Under one-fifth (18%) of the schools in our survey made regular use of volunteers in the school office. Of those that did, the majority (90%) had 5 people or fewer working in this capacity. Only 2 schools (4%) reported having more than 5 office helpers.

The use of volunteers in the yard or lunchroom was also mentioned relatively rarely (13% of the schools responded positively). Once again the majority of these schools (80%) had only a few helpers in these areas (5 or less). Only 5 schools (14%) reported having more than 5 helpers.

The most common form of volunteer use was in the provision of occasional assistance such as driving, telephoning, or giving demonstrations. These could be provided by parents or other community members. Over 80% of the community schools reported they had some such volunteer assistance. Although usually only a few people would be helping out in this way (less than 10 persons), sometimes many more volunteers would be involved in a given school. A few schools (10) reported having over 50 people helping out in these ways.

About a third (34%) of the schools in our survey reported that volunteers provided help in "other" ways. Half of this group said that fewer than 20 volunteers were involved, while only 15% mentioned using more than 20 people in this category.

In describing these "other" and, in addition, "occasional" duties of volunteers, respondents mentioned most frequently (42%) general assistance and chaperoning for field trips and special events. The use of volunteers as resource people for speeches, demonstrations, and projects requiring skilled assistance was mentioned by about one-quarter of the schools (26%). A similar number (24%) said that volunteers provided leadership for elective, recreational, or special programs. Providing transportation was reported almost as often (23%). Assistance in the office (e.g. phoning, typing, etc.) and remedial teaching assistance were mentioned as well, but relatively less often (13% and 12% of schools respectively used these descriptions). (Table 129)

Table 128: Use of Volunteer Assistance

n = 271

Area	Number	Percent
In classrooms	165	60.9
In library or resource centres	146	53.9
In office	48	17.7
In the yard or lunchroom	36	13.3
Occasional assistance	220	81.2
Other	90	33.2

(Note: There may be more than 100.0% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 129: Functions of "Occasional" and "Other" Volunteers

n = 271

Function	Number	Percent
As resource persons (speakers, demonstrations)	70	25.8
Providing teaching assistance (remedial work)	33	12.2
Providing leadership (elective, recreational and special programs)	65	24.0
Providing chaperoning and general assistance (field trips and special events)	112	41.3
Providing technical and clerical assistance	36	13.3
Providing transportation	61	22.5
Other	11	4.1

Table 130: School Type by Types of Programs

Types of Programs

	Parent Volunteer Program	Advisory Council re Daytime Program	Childrens' Activities	Adults' Activities	"Open" Facilities	Special Services Provided	Students' Work in Community	Neighbourhood Improvement Projects
School Type				*		*	*	
Elementary Schools	213 (98.2)	92 (44.9)	170 (80.6)	138 (66.0)	155 (76.0)	61 (29.2)	52 (25.1)	81 (39.9)
Secondary Schools	31 (77.5)	20 (52.6)	35 (89.7)	37 (94.9)	33 (82.5)	5 (12.5)	34 (85.0)	18 (45.0)

Table 131: Community Type by Types of Programs

Community Type			*			*		*
Rural Schools	134 (93.1)	63 (47.4)	108 (77.7)	101 (72.1)	107 (77.5)	23 (16.4)	44 (31.2)	45 (33.6)
Urban Schools	111 (96.5)	52 (47.7)	100 (88.5)	78 (70.9)	83 (76.1)	42 (38.2)	43 (39.8)	56 (50.9)

* Using the Chi-Square test, these relationships are significant at the .05 level.

Table 132: Length of Existence of Community School by Types of Programs

	Types of Programs							
	Parent Volunteer Program	Advisory Council re Daytime Program	Childrens' Activities	Adults' Activities	"Open" Facilities	Special Services Provided	Students' Work in Community	Neighbourhood Improvement Projects
Length of Existence								*
Newer Schools (est. since 1971)	119 (93.0)	53 (44.9)	104 (83.9)	93 (76.9)	94 (77.7)	30 (24.4)	39 (32.0)	38 (31.1)
Older Schools (est. prior to 1971)	100 (98.0)	45 (46.9)	87 (87.0)	74 (72.5)	75 (75.0)	31 (30.7)	36 (35.6)	52 (53.1)

* Using the Chi-Square test, these relationships are significant at the .05 level.

We found that the number of elementary schools using volunteers was significantly higher than the number of high schools who had volunteers. Although nearly all (98%) of elementary schools had volunteer programs, only about three-quarters (77%) of secondary schools had them. Still, it can be seen that a large overall percentage (over 80%) of the schools in our survey had volunteer programs. (Table 130)

Although most schools seemed to rely mainly on parents to form their volunteer contingent, some schools mentioned other community members (e.g. retired teachers, forest rangers, and occasionally high school students):

> We have operated a Student Aid program in which students from the nearby Secondary School come to our school during their "free" periods to assist the classroom teacher.

Advisory Committees

About one-half of the schools in our survey (43%) reported that they had members of the community involved in an advisory capacity with respect to the regular daytime program. Although these people might also be part of a community school council or committee, frequently they were not. (Table 133a)

Several different kinds of advice were sought from a wide variety of individuals and groups. Broadly-based committees, usually made up of parents, staff, students and/or other school or community members, were mentioned most often as consultative bodies. The following is a typical comment:

> The Principal of the school meets monthly with a selected group of parents, teachers and students to discuss issues that affect the school. This group does not in any way, however, set school policy.

Close to one-quarter of the schools who had advisory input (24%) mentioned groups of this type. Individuals were consulted almost as often, (by 20% of our schools). In this regard, several schools mentioned consultation with members of the community such as the clergy, health workers, retired teachers or others who had expertise in some specific area of curriculum. Other respondents mentioned that advice from individual parents came frequently during one-to-one, or informal conversations.

The functioning of committees made up of parents only, or parents and teachers only, rather than more broadly based groups was mentioned occasionally. These kinds of groups (parents only, or parents and teachers only) were mentioned by about 22% and 15% respectively of the schools which had advisory bodies. Ad hoc, or special purpose, rather than standing committees were also mentioned several times (12%). In addition, some of our schools (9% and 7% respectively) reported occasionally gaining input from the Home and School Association, or other independently formed groups (e.g. Parks and Recreation, area councils). A few schools (8%) mentioned other ways of seeking advice such as surveys or questionnaires or general open meetings. (Table 133b)

> When we plan changes we bring in the parents, state our views, listen to comments and modify our proposals in line with their suggestions.

Advice was sought most often about issues of school change and the introduction of new programs (e.g. new report cards) or about matters concerning curriculum content (e.g. family life studies). Nearly one-third (32%) of schools who sought advice mentioned program changes and about one-quarter (24%) mentioned curriculum. Other matters such as planning special events or making decisions concerning community involvement itself were reported relatively infrequently (9% and 7% respectively). (Table 133c)

Children's Recreational Programs

In 80% of the schools in our sample there are after-hour or weekend activities taking place for children and/or teenagers. (Table 134a) We found, however, that significantly more urban than rural schools had these programs. In view of the fact that most of the children at many rural schools are bussed in and out and therefore not available for extracurricular programs, this result is not surprising. (Table 131)

Almost all (90%) of the schools with youth programs reported that their activities included or consisted of athletics - team sports, exercise groups, and such classes as dance, yoga, or karate. Over one-half (54%) said also that interest clubs had been formed or that interest courses were offered (e.g. hobby clubs or arts and crafts courses). Youth groups such as 4-H clubs, Girl Guides and Boy Scouts, or drop-in centres were

Table 133a: Membership of Advisory Committees

n = 252

	Number	Percent
Members of community involved in advisory capacity (regular school program)	117	46.4*

*(43% of total sample)

Table 133b: Who was involved

n = 107

	Number	Percent
Individuals	21	19.6
Ad hoc committees	13	12.1
Parent-teacher advisory committees	16	15.0
Parent advisory committees	23	21.5
Community and school committees (parents, staff, students, others)	26	24.3
Home and School Associations (and P.T.A.)	10	9.3
Other Committees (Parks and Rec., Area Council)	7	6.5
Other sampling devices	8	7.5

Table 133c: Type of Advice Sought

n = 82

	Number	Percent
Advice on curriculum	55	67.1
Advice on school change and innovation of new programs	37	45.1
Advice on special events	10	12.2
Advice on parent involvement (e.g. volunteers and support staffing)	8	9.8
Other	2	2.4

(Non-response rate = 30%)

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

also reported frequently (45%). In addition, about one-fifth (20%) of the schools occasionally held special events, such as film nights. Summer programs were mentioned by a few people (5%). Other activities such as ethnic language and cultural programs were mentioned only rarely (2%). (Table 134b)

Three-quarters of the schools having youth programs mentioned at least two of the foregoing types of activities (e.g. athletics and interest clubs). The majority (70%) offered programs in either two or three areas. The remaining one-quarter mentioned only one area. (Table 134c)

The largest number of schools (28%) calculated that they had between 51 and 100 participants in their children's activities. Another one-third (31%) had between 101 and 200. Only 19% reported 50 or fewer and only 17% more than 200. (Table 134d)

Table 134a: Recreational Activities for Youth

n = 263

	Number	Percent
Recreational activities for children or teenagers after-hours or on weekends	216	82.1*

*(80% of total sample)

Table 134b: Types of Activities

n = 216

	Number	Percent
Athletics (sports and exercise)	192	88.9
Interest clubs and courses (hobbies, arts and crafts)	116	53.7
Youth groups (4-H, Drop-ins, Guides, etc.)	98	45.4
Special events	44	20.3
Summer programs	11	5.1
Ethnic language and cultural programs	5	2.3
Other	5	2.3

Table 134c: Number of Areas Mentioned

n = 215

	Number	Percent
one	53	24.7
two	86	40.0
three	64	29.8
four	12	5.6

Table 134d: Number of Participants

n = 216

	Number	Percent
variable/undetermined	9	4.2
0 - 25	8	3.7
26 - 50	36	16.7
51 - 100	60	27.8
101 - 150	33	15.3
151 - 200	33	15.3
201 - 300	21	9.7
301 - 500	12	5.5
501 or more	4	1.8

Adult Programs

Over two-thirds of the schools (68%) said that there were regularly scheduled programs for adults. (Table 135a) These were either recreational or educational in nature. Our results show a highly significant difference between percentages of elementary and secondary schools with adult activities. Secondary schools were much more likely to have these programs (95% of secondary as opposed to 66% of elementary schools). (Table 130)

As with children's activities, a wide variety of programs were mentioned. Once again, schools reported athletic activities most frequently (79%), followed by interest clubs and courses (58%). Community and special interest groups (e.g. Ratepayers, Parents without Partners) were reported by about one-third of the schools with adult programs. Just over one-quarter (26%) had academic upgrading or basic education courses. Special events were mentioned relatively infrequently (7%). (Table 135b)

Nearly one-third of the schools (32%) reported only one area of activity (e.g. athletics). The majority, (63%) as with children's programs, mentioned either two or three areas. (Table 135c)

Nearly two-thirds (60%) of the schools calculated 100 participants or fewer for their adult programs. Of these, the majority (32%) had 50 or fewer. Relatively few (8%) reported between 101 and 150. Interestingly, although most programs were fairly small, there were a few that involved very large numbers. Twelve schools (7%) had more than 500 participants. About equal numbers had either 151-200 (6%), 201-300 (7%), or 300-500 (6%). (Table 135d)

It must be noted that although relative weightings are probably accurate with respect to percentages concerning programs, absolute numbers may not be. We suspect that this is true of adult programs, but may also apply to children's activities. Apparently some schools, in answering our survey, did not include programs that were administered by outside agencies (e.g. community colleges) while others did. This means that for some schools, we did not get as accurate a picture of the full number and variety of continuous activities as we did for others. Our sample is wide enough, however, that we can be reasonably confident that relative amounts of difference and similarity between and among various program factors are valid.

Table 135a: Recreational Activities for Adults

n = 259

	Number	Percent
Regular recreational or educational activities for adults	183	70.7*

*(68% of total sample)

Table 135b: Types of Activities

n = 183

	Number	Percent
Athletics (sports and exercise)	145	79.2
Interest courses and clubs	106	57.9
Community and special events groups	59	32.2
Academic upgrading and basic education	48	26.2
Special events	13	7.1
Other	2	1.1

Table 135c: Number of Areas Mentioned

n = 183

	Number	Precent
one	58	31.7
two	71	38.8
three	45	24.6
four	10	5.5

Table 135d: Number of Participants

n = 183

	Number	Percent
0 - 50	59	32.2
51 - 100	50	27.3
101 - 150	15	8.2
151 - 200	10	5.5
201 - 300	12	6.6
301 - 500	10	5.5
500 or more	12	6.6
variable/undetermined	6	3.3

School Areas Open to the Community

Nearly three-quarters (73%) of our schools have some areas open to the community on a regular basis. (Table 136a) The area most likely to be open, mentioned by over two-thirds of these schools (68%), was the gym. Swimming pools were mentioned by only 5%, reflecting perhaps the number of schools with pools rather than those that allow use of them. Over

40% mentioned that classrooms and teaching areas were open to the public on a regular basis. Another often-opened area was the library or resource centre, reported by about one-quarter of the schools (24%). Relatively few (11%) talked about non-teaching areas such as staffrooms or cafeterias. Only 4% of the schools listed the playground or yard in this regard. Several schools (9%) described all areas as being open. (Table 136b)

Table 136a: Open Areas in the School

n = 257

	Number	Percent
Areas open regularly to the community	197	76.7*

*(73% of total sample)

Table 136b: Types of Open Areas

n = 197

	Number	Percent
Gymnasium	134	68.0
Swimming pool	10	5.1
Resource centre/library	48	24.4
Other teaching areas (classrooms, home-ec rooms, etc.)	83	42.1
Non-teaching areas	21	10.7
Playground	8	4.1
All areas	18	9.1

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Special Services

The number of schools in our survey that offered special services (e.g. medical care) to the general public was about one-quarter of the total sample (24%). (Table 137a)

Over one-half (53%) of those who had special services mentioned some kind of medical or dental care. Daycare services were mentioned several times (29%). Just under one-third (29%) reported that some kind of counselling was available - either legal, personal, or academic. Other social services were mentioned by approximately one-fifth of the respondents (e.g. pre-school programs, library services, welfare services, income tax services). (Table 137b)

Our results show significant differences with respect to special services along two dimensions. We found that elementary schools were much more likely than secondary schools to provide these services and that urban schools were much more likely to provide services than rural ones. This latter effect may once again be due to the large number of consolidated schools in rural areas whose students tend to live further away from the school. Services offered seemed to be highly reflective of the population living in close proximity to the school. For example, inner-city schools might be more likely to have welfare and basic medical services while suburban school might tend to offer library services or personal and academic counselling. (Tables 130 and 131)

Table 137a: Special Services

n = 262

	Number	Percent
Services provided for the general public at school	66	25.2*

*(24% of total sample)

Table 137b: Types of Services

n = 66

	Number	Percent
Medical/dental care	35	53.0
Daycare	19	8.8
Legal counselling	4	6.1
Personal counselling	8	12.1
Academic counselling	7	10.6
Other	15	22.7

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Community Work

We asked the schools in our survey whether daytime students were involved through the school in community work. About one-third (34%) of the schools indicated that this was the case. (Table 138a) As might be expected, a much larger proportion of high schools than elementary (85% vs. 25%) had their students involved in community work. (Table 130)

The second part of this question asked that they specify the nature of the students' involvement. The largest portion (28% of the respondents or 25 persons) said that students were involved in programs to assist senior citizens or handicapped persons. Almost one-quarter (24%) of the respondents said that students at time provided leadership for recreational programs and for youth groups. Some respondents (22%) made mention of student being active in providing aid to other schools (e.g. nursery or elementary schools). A similar proportion (19%) said students were involved in charity work. This included canvassing, neighbourhood cleanup, walkathons, and other projects. (Table 138b)

Twelve persons (14%) indicated that students at their schools were involved in babysitting for night school programs or parents' meetings. The same proportion said that work was done by students in local businesses. Other forms of student involvement in the community were mentioned by several respondents (16 persons). These included such things as participation by students on community committees, assistance with special events (festivals, carnivals, etc.) and involvement with social agencies. (Table 138b)

Table 138a: Community Work

n = 261

	Number	Percent
Daytime students involved in community work	91	34.9*

*(34% of total sample)

Neighbourhood Improvement Programs

The final question of this section asked whether the community school had been involved in any neighbourhood improvement projects. Just over one-third (38%) of the total sample of schools replied affirmatively to this question. (Table 139a) There was, however, a difference in the way rural and urban schools responded. Urban schools were more likely to say that projects had been undertaken at their schools (51% vs. 34%). We also noted a difference in the response patterns of schools with recently-developed community programs and those whose programs had been established prior to 1971. Schools with older community programs were less likely to have been involved in neighbourhood improvement projects than were schools with more recent programs (53% vs. 31%). (Tables 131 and 132)

Table 138b: Types of Work

n = 88

	Number	Percent
Aid to senior citizens or handicapped	25	28.4
Leadership of recreational and youth programs	21	23.9
Aid to other schools	19	21.6
Charity work	17	19.3
Babysitting for evening activities	12	13.6
Work in local businesses	12	13.6
Work in hospitals	7	8.0
Other	16	18.2

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

The largest group of respondents (34%) said that their school had taken part in neighbourhood clean-up projects. Often this involved cleaning up a local park or street. About the same proportion of respondents (31%) said that the community school had assisted in building or providing a playground or some other recreational facility for the area. Some schools (19%) had also been involved in gardening projects (e.g. planting trees and flowers) and a somewhat larger proportion (23%) mentioned one or more special projects that they had participated in. These included summer work programs, neighbourhood distributions of food, making Christmas toys, and conducting studies on pollution. Just under one-fifth of the respondents (17%) said that their school had been socially active by conducting petitions and surveys for the community. Only a few schools (7%) specifically mentioned fundraising projects (e.g. walkathons and canvassing). (Table 139b)

One measure was taken to determine how extensively the schools in our survey were involved with their communities. To do this, we calculated how many of the eight areas of involvement had been initiated at each of these community schools. These areas are: (1) volunteer programs (2) community involved in advisory capacity with regards to school programs (3) recreational activities for children (4) recreational/educational activities for adults (5) open areas for public use (6) special services provided to public (7) students involved in community work (8) neighbourhood improvement projects. The measure we took does not given an indication of the extent to which the schools are active in any particular program. That is, it is not in anyway a weighted total but is simply a measure of the number of programs. Of the eight areas, it was found that almost two-thirds (63%) of the schools in our survey had indicated involvement in either four, five, or six of these areas. A further one-tenth of the schools replied that seven of the programs had been initiated at their schools. An additional 3% stated that there was involvement in all eight areas. That is, almost 80% of the schools in our sample had at least four of these programs taking place. These results are interesting in that they are very indicative of the diversification and exploration of these schools into all areas of community involvement. (Table 140)

Table 139a: Neighbourhood Improvement Projects

n = 256

	Number	Percent
Involvement of school in neighbourhood improvement projects	104	40.6*

*(38% of total sample)

ORGANIZATION

One series of questions dealt with patterns of communication between community and school; that is, links that had been established to ease the transfer of information and to facilitate understanding. We tried to determine what efforts had been made to assess community needs and wishes as well as to provide the community with information about activities and happenings at the school. (Tables 141 and 142)

Exactly three-quarters of the schools in our survey reported that they had tried to determine community feelings for the planning of future programs and activities. This was done on both formal and informal

Table 139b: Types of Projects

n = 103

	Number	Percent
Clean-up projects	35	34.0
Assistance in building playgrounds, etc.	32	31.1
Gardening	20	19.4
Special projects	24	23.3
Social action (petitions, surveys, etc.)	17	16.5
Fundraising	7	6.8
Other	6	5.8

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 140: Extensiveness of School's Involvement

n = 271

	Number	Percent
one activity	13	4.8
two activities	19	7.0
three activities	33	12.2
four activities	68	25.1
five activities	63	23.2
six activities	40	14.8
seven activities	26	9.6
eight activities	9	3.3

bases. Just over half of the group that responded (51%) said that the impetus had been taken in an active and quite formal way by community school personnel. This was done by sending some kind of survey form (questionnaire, flyer, etc.) to members of the community, requesting that they identify needs or provide some other type of information. Alternatively, community members were contacted by phone and their input was solicited.

Quite often (23% of the cases) views of the community were obtained via a community advisory board or some other such body which, in these instances, acted as a liaison between community and school.

A large number of respondents (39%) reported that informal contact with parents or other community members was one means of obtaining community views or assessing needs. Chatting with different individuals or simply observing community members interact were mentioned in several cases.

Frequently (in 21% of the cases) it appears that the community has taken the active role and made their needs known without the school taking the initiative to solicit input.

A substantial proportion of respondents (30%) indicated that open meetings at the school or in some other public place provided an excellent forum for parental and community opinions. Community issues raised at these meetings, or concerns that are prominent in the local media (T.V., radio, newspapers) might be a general reflection or indication of community needs.

As a few respondents (8%) pointed out, public responses to existing programs and attendance records at school events and activities provided a good means of measuring the success of any given program and of determining if an alternate or additional activity might be equally or more appealing.

In a similar way, conversations with members of the school body (particularly community members who work in the school and/or students) often yielded information regarding community needs.

The second part of school-community communication deals with ways that information regarding community school activities is made available to community members. Again, it seems that the school can take an active role in this respect or alternatively rely more on a "grapevine" method of communication.

An overwhelming majority of respondents (97%) said that at times they relied on newsletters or bulletins to provide information to parents and community members. Just over half (52%) of those answering this question made mention of using community media to this end. That is, activities at the school would be publicized through the local newspaper, radio, etc. or information might be posted in a public place.

A large number of schools (40%) had, on occasion, made personal contact with the community. Community people had been contacted by telephone, had been approached at public meetings or open houses, or had been visited at their homes for the purpose of providing them with information.

About one-quarter of the respondents (22%) mentioned that they used unofficial channels of communication. It was felt that a message given to students and local organizations would eventually be passed along to most members of the community via the local grapevine.

Some respondents (7%) said that an advisory council or other community school group served as a vehicle to inform community members of the activities and happenings at the school.

By far the most effective method of providing information seems to be issuing newsletters or bulletins. A majority of respondents (60%) indicated that this was the case. (Table 142b)

Table 141: Needs Assessment

n = 205

NR = 24%

	Number	Percent
Survey (letters, flyers, phone calls, etc.)	105	51.2
Consultation with Advisory Councils	48	23.4
Informal contact	80	39.0
Expressed need by community (unsolicited)	42	20.5
Public meetings	62	30.2
Public response	17	8.3
Within-school input	20	9.8
Other	5	2.4

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 142: Informing the Community

142a: Ways of Informing the Community

n = 201

NR = 26%

	Number	Percent
Newsletters and bulletins	194	96.5
Community media	104	51.7
Public contact	80	39.8
Verbal messages	45	22.4
Informing Advisory Council	14	7.0
Other	2	1.0

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 142b: Most Effective Method of Informing the Community

n = 236

	Number	Percent
Newsletters	142	60.2
Public contact	53	22.5
Community media	39	16.5
Verbal messages	26	11.0
Informing Advisory Council	3	1.3
Other	1	0.4
None	16	6.8
All	15	6.4

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Some respondents (23%) indicated that public contact was probably the most successful way of dispersing information and several others (17%) would rely most heavily on the community media. A few individuals (7%) said no method of communication was really effective and a similar proportion felt that all methods were equally successful.

Respondents were asked whether a core group of individuals (such as an advisory or executive body) had been established to co-ordinate or oversee community activities at their schools. The response was almost evenly divided, with a marginally larger proportion of respondents reporting that such an association had been formed. (Table 143) It is, perhaps, interesting to note that of those schools that indicated that they had a core group of individuals, there was a greater proportion of elementary than of secondary schools (51% vs. 34%). This difference of 17% was, however, not statistically significant. A similar, and much more noteworthy trend is evident when comparing rural and urban schools. Urban schools were far more apt to have established an association (60% vs. 39%). This is a statistically significant relationship. (Table 144)

Respondents were queried as to the format and functioning of these community school associations. From their individual descriptions, a typical profile emerged. Usually the association had a fairly brief span of existence: over one-half of the respondents (53%) stated that the group had been in operation for a period of less than three years. In fact, over four-fifths of schools with associations reported that their group had been formed since 1970. Ten schools had associations with a somewhat greater longevity - in these cases, the groups had been functioning for more than ten years. (Table 145)

There were other features of a typical community school organization. It was somewhat unlikely that a formal constitution had been drawn up to outline the official structure and workings of the association. Only slightly more than a quarter of the cases (29%) had constitutions. (See Table 146) Meetings were generally held at least once a month. Almost two-thirds of the respondents (62%) reported that this was the case. An additional one-fifth (18%) said that the group met between 3 and 6 times a year. A similar proportion replied that meetings were variable and were called as they were necessary. (Table 147)

Membership in the group was somewhat varied. Many schools seemed to have made every effort to represent all segments of the communities and to avoid restricting memberhship simply to school constituents (students, staff, parents). There were, however, several consistencies. Invariably the school Principal and one or more parents were included in the membership. In only 10 cases was the Principal not mentioned as included in the group's membership. (Table 149a)

In addition, the overall size of the association seemed to be quite consistent. A large majority of respondents (78%) reported that there were fewer than 20 persons on the membership roster. About half of these associations had fewer than 10 members, while a similiar proportion had between 10 and 20 members. (Table 148)

It is interesting to examine the ways that the membership was constituted. As previously mentioned, virtually all associations had parents as members. In a majority of cases (59%) the number of parents ranged from one to ten. A smaller proportion (13%) had between 11 and 15 parents on their associations. A similar percentage said that the number varied or was indeterminate. (Table 149b)

Not all community school associations had teacher membership. Almost three-quarters (71%) of schools having associations reported that teachers were included among the members. The number of teachers was almost never greater than 5. This was true in over 80% of the cases. One school, however, reported having more than 20 teachers on the association. (Table 149c)

Less than half (37%) of those schools with associations indicated that the membership included students. The largest proportion of this group (52%) said that there were either one or two students who participated. Another one-third (30%) had a student membership of between 3 and 10 people. (Table 149d)

As noted earlier, the membership in many associations is far more comprehensive than just teachers, students, and parents. Schools have drawn on the resources of all segments of the community to achieve a wider and more representative scope of opinion.

Almost one-half of the respondents (60 persons) made mention of "other" individuals who were involved with the community school association. Almost three-quarters of these respondents (73%) said there were between 1 and 5 members in this "other" category was variable or indeterminate. (Table 149c) The largest group of respondents (40%) said that some of the other members were residents of the community. Just over one-quarter (27%) mentioned that the Vice-Principal or other non-teaching staff members were included. In addition, over one-fifth (22%) of the associations had social or community workers as members. Some other responses were frequently given: priest/minister (18%), parks and recreation persons (16%), and Board members (14%). Only 8% of the respondents (5 persons) had community college representatives on their associations. (Table 150)

Table 143: Coordinating Core Group

n = 249

	Number	Percent
Schools with core groups overseeing or coordinating community activities	126	50.6*

*(47% of total sample)

Table 144: School Type and Community Type by Existence of Community School Associations

n = 116	Schools with Community School Associations	
School Type	Number	Percent
Elementary	104	51.0
Secondary	12	34.3
n = 106		
Community Type**		
Rural	51	38.6
Urban	65	59.6

**Using the Chi-Square test, these relationships are significant at the .05 level.

Table 145: Span of Existence of Core Group

n = 122

	Number	Percent
less than 3 years	65	53.3
3 - 5 years	35	28.7
6 - 9 years	12	9.8
more than 10 years	10	8.2

Table 146: Constitution

n = 126

	Number	Percent
Schools with constitutions	37	29.4

Table 147: Frequency of Meetings

n = 122

	Number	Percent
variable	22	18.0
once a month or more	75	61.5
3 - 6 times a year	22	18.0
less than 3 times	3	2.5

Table 148: Number of Members

n = 125

	Number	Percent
variable	11	8.8
0 - 10	53	42.4
11 - 20	45	36.0
21 - 30	6	4.8
31 - 40	2	1.6
41 - 50	4	3.2
more than 50	4	3.2

Table 149: Types of Members

149a: Principals	Number of Principals	Number	Percent
n = 116	1	102	88.0
	2	5	4.3
	3 - 5	3	2.6
	variable/undetermined	6	5.2

Table 149 (con't)

149b:	Parents	Number of Parents	Number	Percent
	n = 116	1 - 5	28	24.1
		6 - 10	40	34.5
		11 - 15	15	12.9
		16 - 20	6	5.2
		21 - 25	1	0.9
		26 - 35	4	3.4
		more than 35	9	7.8
		variable/undetermined	13	11.2

149c:	Teachers	Number of Teachers	Number	Percent
	n = 90	1	27	30.0
		2	21	23.3
		3 - 5	25	27.8
		6 - 10	4	4.4
		11 - 15	1	1.1
		16 - 20	1	1.1
		more than 20	1	1.1
		variable	10	11.1

149d:	Students	Number of Students	Number	Percent
	n = 46	1	11	24.0
		2	13	28.3
		3 - 5	7	15.2
		6 - 10	7	15.2
		more than 15	2	4.3
		variable/undetermined	6	13.0

149e:	Others	Number of Others	Number	Percent
	n = 60	1 - 5	44	73.3
		6 - 10	2	3.3
		11 - 15	1	1.7
		16 - 20	3	5.0
		21 - 25	1	1.7
		variable/undetermined	9	15.0

Table 150: Who are the other members?

n = 63

	Number	Percent
Vice Principal or other staff	17	27.0
Residents	25	39.7
Community college representatives	5	7.9
Parks and recreation representatives	10	15.9
Social workers	14	22.2
Priest or minister	11	17.5
Board members	9	14.3
Others	9	14.3

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

STAFFING

Our survey asked a number of questions concerning the staffing of community school activities. We were interested in how many instructors or supervisors were involved in the programs and what percentage of these people were paid. We also asked whether one person had been designated to be responsible for community activities and, if so, what his/her title and responsibilities were. Finally, we were interested in the degree of involvement of regular full-time school staff in community activities.

Almost two-thirds of the schools in our survey (65%) reported that the regular school staff was involved in their community activities. Of these, nearly all (88%) noted that this interest and effort extended beyond the usual school day - after-school, nights and occasionally on weekends or during the summer. (Table 151)

Our schools reported most frequently (66%) that staff members (who were active in community programs) were involved in leadership, instruction, or supervision of these activities. Nearly one-half (46%) also mentioned coordination, organization, and direction of the programs. Other roles were mentioned less often. Twenty-five percent described general participation, that is, sitting on committees, attending meetings or courses; 19%, advisory functions, that is, counselling or serving as a resource; and 3%, providing technical assistance. (Table 152)

Close to one-half of all the schools (46%) responded positively to the question concerning whether or not one person was designated as responsible for community activities. Of these, over one-half (58%) labelled this person community school director, worker, or leader. Other role-labels mentioned included the regular school Principal or director (16%), Parks and Recreation people (6%), and occasionally President or Chairman of the local Community School Association or Home and School (4%). In only one case was a community college liaison person mentioned. (Table 153a and b)

One school mentioned that the maintenance man took responsibility for community activities. This rather unusual designation may be more apt than it seems, for, throughout the survey, many schools mentioned that the cooperation of and salary for maintenance was a critical factor in their ability to carry out activities successfully.

Some community school workers were involved with other schools as well, although a higher percentage were attached to one school only (65%, as opposed to 35% with other school affiliations). (Table 153c)

Major responsibilities for these people involved program planning and administration (e.g. timetabling, supervision, initiation and facilitation of programs, arranging meetings), mentioned by nearly two-thirds (63%), and coordination (e.g. liaison and communication with Board, community agencies, committees, etc.), mentioned by a similar number (62%). Advisory duties, such as acting as a resource to the school, community councils, etc., were mentioned by several schools (34%). Staff selection and care of facilities and equipment (including bookings) were each mentioned by about 20% of the schools. Other tasks such as handling finances and counselling were mentioned rarely (by 10% and 4% respectively). (Table 153d)

We asked the schools which reported having special activities for children and teenagers to indicate the number of people working as instructors or supervisors for these programs. Almost one-third of these schools (32%) reported having no more than five workers, while a similar proportion had between six and ten. Just about a tenth of the schools (11%) had more than twenty workers. An additional 6% said that the number varied or was indeterminate. (Table 154a)

53% of those who had workers for their young people's activities reported that these workers were unpaid. Only 9% of the school said that all workers were paid. In the remainder of the schools, the percentage of paid workers varied widely. (Table 154b)

The number of instructors or supervisors working in adult programs is quite comparable with figures reported for children's programs. About two-thirds of the schools (68%) had ten workers or fewer for their adult programs and only 12% of the schools had more than twenty workers. (Table 155a)

In contrast to the situation with regards to children's programs, more than three-quarters (76%) of the schools in our survey reported that they paid some of the instructors of their adult programs. About one-third (35%) paid all staff. Proportions of schools paying up to a quarter, between a quarter and a half, or from a half to 99% of their instructors were equal (11%). (Table 155b)

Table 151: School Staff Involvement

	n = 250	Number	Percent
a:	Staff members involved in community school activities	175	70.0*
		*(65% of total sample)	
	n = 179		
	NR = 34%		
b:	Staff members involved outside regular school hours	158	88.3

Table 152: Type of Involvement

n = 175

	Number	Percent
Leadership, instruction, supervision	115	65.7
Co-ordination, organization, direction direction of programs	81	46.3
Participation	43	24.6
Advisory services	34	19.4
Technical assistance	5	2.9
Other	2	1.1

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 153a: Designation of Responsibility for Community Activities to One Person

n = 235

	Number	Percent
Schools with one person acting as co-ordinator or supervisor of community activities	125	53.2*

*(46% of total sample)

153b: Title of Person

n = 125

	Number	Percent
Community school co-ordinator/ leader/director/worker	73	58.4
Night school director/principal/ supervisor	14	11.2
Principal	20	16.0
Parks and Recreation person	8	6.4
President/chairman	5	4.0
Community college liaison person	1	0.8
Other	4	3.2

153c: Persons Involved in Activities at more than One Community School

n = 118

Number	Percent
44	37.3*

(*35% of schools with community workers)

Table 153d: Responsibilities of Person

n = 125

	Number	Percent
Program planning and administration	79	63.2
Staff selection	26	20.8
Co-ordination	77	61.6
Advisory and resource duties	42	33.6
Care of facilities and equipment	24	19.2
Handling finances	12	9.6
Counselling - personal and guidance	5	4.0
Other	3	2.4

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 154: Children's Program Instructors

154a: n = 215

Number of Instructors	Number	Percent
0 - 5	68	31.6
6 - 10	65	30.2
11 - 15	29	13.5
16 - 20	17	7.9
21 - 25	9	4.2
26 - 40	10	4.7
41 - 60	4	1.9
over 60	1	0.5
variable/undetermined	12	5.6

154b: n = 213

Percentage of paid instructors:	Number	Percent
0	113	53.1
up to 25%	22	10.3
26 - 50%	22	10.3
51 - 75%	9	4.2
76 - 99&	5	2.3
all	26	12.2
regular staff only	4	1.9
variable/undetermined	12	5.6

Table 155: Adult Program Instructors

155a: n = 184

Number of Instructors:	Number	Percent
0 - 5	86	46.7
6 - 10	39	21.2
11 - 15	17	9.2
16 - 20	10	5.4
21 - 25	6	3.3
26 - 30	4	2.2
31 - 40	6	3.3
more than 40	6	3.3
variable/undetermined	10	5.4

155b: n = 184

Percentage of paid instructors:	Number	Percent
0	45	24.5
up to 25%	21	11.4
26 - 50%	21	11.4
51 - 75%	10	5.4
76 - 99%	11	6.0
all	64	34.8
variable/undetermined	12	6.5

FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

In planning and operating programs and activities for the community, financial costs will, invariably, be incurred. Sources of funding are not always readily available and respondents frequently said that one barrier to the successful operation of their community school was difficulty in raising adequate funds. Having to meet the demands and expectations of the community while trying to stay within the bounds of a strict budget is not always an easy task. We asked respondents to indicate all of their sources of funding for community school expenses and to list exactly what these expenses might be.

Three possible sources of funding were suggested to the respondents and we asked that they choose all relevant ones. In the other category, they were to note any additional sources of funding not included in our list. The three sources of funding were: fees from members or users, funds raised through special activities, and the Board of Education. (Table 156a)

The Board of Education was by far the most frequently mentioned source of funding. Almost two-thirds of the respondents (64%) indicated that the local Board had provided some financial assistance. Another main source of funding seemed to be fees from members or users (44%). A significantly larger proportion of secondary than of elementary schools (68% vs. 39%) said that they relied somewhat on fees from members or users. This same distinction was noted between the responses of rural and urban schools. More rural schools (50%) than urban (35%) cited fees as one of their sources of funding. (Tables 157 and 158)

Slightly more than one-third of the respondents (34%) reported that some funds were raised through activities such as sales and drives. Here again, there was a different response pattern for each school type. Elementary schools were more likely to hold special fund-raising activities than were secondary schools (39% vs. 15%). (Table 157)

There were several sources of funding mentioned in the other category. A number of respondents (16%) said that some kind of government grant had been provided to encourage them to initiate community programs or further develop existing ones. Close to one-tenth mentioned financial assistance given to them by the Parks and Recreation department. Urban schools were more apt to indicate support from Parks and Recreation than were rural schools (16% vs. 5%). (Table 158) While this difference of 11% is statistically significant, it should be kept in mind that the numbers of respondents in both instances were relatively small. A few other schools had received support from community colleges (4%) and a similar proportion had been aided by local organizations and businesses. Some individuals cited miscellaneous sources of funding: private donations, the Ministry of Culture and Recreation, and the city council. In some cases arrangements had been made which eliminated some of the problems of procuring funds. In this case, both community and school served to gain by offering each other services that were desired. As one respondent expressed it:

> We have some trade-offs with the community. i.e., we do not charge for recreational community use of the school. The community does not charge us for snow ploughing, sanding or removal of snow.

Funds from all of these sources were used most often for supplies (68%). Other expenses were salary allowances (46%) and maintenance (35%). In addition, a few respondents (5% and 9% respectively) mentioned that money was allotted for advertising and for transportation (e.g. field trip expenses). (Table 156b)

Table 156: Funding

156a: n = 271

Sources of Funding	Numbers	Percent
Fees from members and users	119	43.9
Funds from special activities	93	34.3
Board of Education	173	63.8
Government grants	42	15.5
Community colleges	12	4.4
Parks and Recreation	26	9.6
Organizations and businesses	12	4.4
Other	8	3.0

156b: n = 271

Purposes of these Funds	Number	Percent
Maintenance	96	35.4
Supplies	184	67.9
Salaries and fees	125	46.1
Advertising	13	4.8
Transportation	24	8.9
Other	5	1.8

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 157: School Type by Sources of Funding

	Fees from Members	Sales/ Drives	B. of E. Grants	Gov't. Grants	Community Colleges	Parks & Recreation	Organizations/ Businesses
School Type	*	*					
Elementary	85 (39.2)	84 (38.7)	138 (63.6)	34 (15.7)	10 (4.6)	18 (8.3)	9 (4.1)
Secondary	27 (67.5)	6 (15.0)	25 (65.0)	6 (15.0)	1 (2.5)	7 (17.5)	3 (7.5)

Table 158: Community Type by Sources of Funding

	Fees from Members	Sales/ Drives	B. of E. Grants	Gov't. Grants	Community Colleges	Parks & Recreation	Organizations/ Businesses
Community Type	*					*	
Rural	72 (50.0)	44 (30.6)	88 (61.1)	19 (13.2)	9 (6.3)	7 (4.9)	4 (2.8)
Urban	40 (34.8)	46 (40.0)	78 (67.8)	22 (19.1)	2 (1.7)	18 (15.7)	7 (6.1)

* Using the Chi-Square test, these relationships are significant at the .05 level.

We gave the respondents an opportunity to consider, and perhaps evaluate, their community schools in a more general and comprehensive way. This more encompassing perspective provided information to supplement that obtained about the specific details of operation and organization of community programs. Respondents were asked to indicate factors contributing to the successful operation of their community schools, and forces or circumstances that they felt had been barriers. In addition, we tried to determine how the incidence of vandalism might have been affected by increased community use of the school.

In answering the latter query, the greatest proportion of respondents (75%) indicated that having the community in the school served as a deterrent to vandalism or that they had experienced very little or no vandalism since community programs had been initiated. Only a very small number of individuals (5%) thought than an open school was an invitation to willful damage. A few respondents (9%) felt that there was no real relationship, taking the position that community use neither prevented nor invited vandalism, but that other factors were probably more important. An additional 7% of the respondents were unable to determine what the relationship might be. (Table 159)

Table 159: Effect of Community Use on Vandalism
n = 248

	Number	Percent
Deterrent	186	75.0
Invitation	12	4.8
Both	9	3.6
Neither deterrent nor invitation	21	8.5
Undetermined/not sure	18	7.3
Other	2	0.8

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Very often, respondents who claimed that community use reduced vandalism said that this was because the school would become viewed in a more positive light. Some typical comments illustrate this point:

> If anything, community use of schools is giving the people a respect for property and a pride in keeping it in a good shape.
>
> We have had no problem whatsoever with vandalism. The fact that the school is no longer a "school" per se but a place to enjoy, seems to act as a deterrent.
>
> In my experience both in this school and in others, notably ---, vandalism was completely diminished because both students and adults felt and believed that "this is our school."
>
> We have very little vandalism as students are asked to participate in tree, shrub and flower planting and they take more interest in their own work.

A distinction was often drawn between "major" and "minor" vandalism. While minor incidences (lost property or increased wear and tear on the building) sometimes increased, several respondents experienced fewer serious problems:

> It would appear that "minor" vandalism increases with use, yet "major" vandalism is deterred by the continual close presence of people in the school.
>
> Generally a deterrent. For every pair of running shoes lost when a community school group was in the school, there seems to have been five fewer windows broken. Hard core vandalism at present - nil.
>
> Certainly school use prevents major vandalism.

Another point was made that there might initially be more occurrences of vandalism, but in the long run, after a period of adjustment and habituation, these would disappear:

> At first damage and vandalism will occur, but as the community becomes educated to the use of their schools, this aspect is greatly reduced.

Frequently, it was mentioned that there was a relationship between incidences of vandalism and quality of supervisory personnel:

> Deterrent to vandalism. However, insensitive staff can induce vandalism.
>
> Outside vandalism is reduced, but inside damage occurs in direct proportion to the quality of personnel running the activities.

> My experience is that if the program in the school is well supervised - particularly by those involved, there is no willful damage and the likelihood of vandalism is lessened.
>
> Adequate supervision promotes a healthy attitude towards having the community use the school for various functions.
>
> Vandalism will result unless supervisors do their respective jobs adequately.

Respondents were asked to indicate factors contributing to the success of their community schools. Just over three-quarters (77%) of those surveyed replied to this question. From the responses, a very wide range of conditions for success was noted. (Table 160)

Two particular responses, however, were mentioned far more frequently than any others - these were participant support and staff and administrative support. It was felt by almost two-thirds of the respondents (60%) that the enthusiasm and support of all or some participants (parents, students, and other community members) accounted to a large extent for the successful operation of the community school. Some typical comments were the following:

> Whatever success has been achieved by the consultation committee is due to a small group of parents who show up regularly at meetings and make some attempt to promote and bolster community interest.
>
> The active, real involvement of dedicated parents to meet a legitimate need of a community.
>
> Parent involvement has brought identification with school and understanding and appreciation of our objectives.
>
> A number of dedicated, well organized management committees from the community whom (we suggest humbly) were welcomed, supported, encouraged and trusted to carry out their program.
>
> The "community school" is as yet not a success. It is in the process of breaking down the fears of the parents and educating the parents to the fact that the school is their school for their use.

An almost equally large proportion of respondents (53%) suggested the importance of staff and administrative support - that is, the commitment and enthusiasm of the Principal, the school staff, and the Board in meeting the needs of the community:

> Interest, enthusiasm, involvement and not pushing too quickly.
>
> Perseverance - especially when the group was attempting to get organized.
>
> Co-operative custodians.

Over one quarter (27%) of those that replied to this question said that one key element of success was communication between school and community members. They felt that a successful community program could not be implemented without the cooperation and "working together" of all parties involved. This notion of a team effort approach is expressed particularly well in these comments:

> Willingness of school and community personnel to cooperate and to respect the wishes and requirements of each other.
>
> Excellent two-way communication between school and community in which neither side regards the other as either a threat or an interloper.
>
> Co-operative dialogues on an on-going basis between those actually involved.

One necessary ingredient of success seems to be the accurate assessment of community needs. This factor was mentioned by almost one-fifth of the respondents (19%). It is unlikely that any program will succeed, no matter how much time or money has been invested in it, if it is not geared to community desires or needs.

Over one-tenth of the respondents (13%) mentioned the importance of good organization and supervision in operating a successful community school. A similiar proportion (14%) said that their success was in part a function of the availability, quality, or location of their facilities. Some individuals mentioned that the school was one of the few places in the community that was available for use:

> I don't think it has been a complete success. Insofar as it has been, factors of success would have to include lack of other facilities in the community.

In addition to factors contributing to the success of a community school, we were interested in determining what had been encountered. Here again, many concerns were reported. (Table 161)

Table 160: Factors Contributing to Success of Community Schools

n = 209

NR = 23%

	Number	Percent
Participant support	126	60.3
Staff and administrative support	110	52.6
Community - school relations	57	27.3
Need assessment and appropriate programming	40	19.1
Organization and supervision	27	12.9
Facilities	29	13.9
Cost factors	9	4.3
Other	1	0.5

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Table 161: Barriers to Success of Community Schools

n = 203

NR = 25%

	Number	Percent
Lack of time	28	13.8
Lack of funds	37	18.2
Lack of facilities	19	9.4
Lack of leadership	43	21.2
Participant apathy	78	38.4
Staff, administrative resistance	35	17.2
Red tape	42	20.7
Other	7	3.4
None	30	14.8

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Although several respondents cited physical constraints (i.e. time, funds, and facilities) as sources of frustration, the largest proportion (38%) indicated that the major barrier was lack of interest - that is, apathy or resistance on the part of parents, students, and other community members. This may reflect a general lack of interest or alternatively, it could be that community members have other time commitments, are hampered by distance to the school, or feel culturally separate from the school. These typical comments indicate some of these concerns:

> Weather and parents.
>
> Parental involvement. There appear to be apathy.
>
> Indifference, disinterest on part of adults - biggest majority are too busy with own activities to involve themselves in school activities.
>
> Usual problems of making the public aware of what is available, and comfortable in freely approaching us.

One particular aspect of this lack of participant support may be that there are strong divisive forces within the community. These certainly could hinder the success of any community program:

> Pettiness, inter-community friction.
>
> Social divisions within the community, e.g. older citizens vs. younger; new citizens vs. established; the core vs. the new subdivisions; the progressive vs. the "no change".

Other concerns focussed on the difficulty of operating community activities within a given set of limitations. Even when the expectations of the community and of the school were consistent and mutually reinforcing and when the groups were willing to work together toward meeting these goals, there were sometimes constraining factors such as lack of funds, facilities, or time. These often hindered or delayed the achievement of goals.

Almost 15% of the respondents (14%) felt that the lack of time was a barrier. The school teaching staff and the Principal were often too committed to the regular school program to be able to allot an adequate portion of time to the community program. One respondent aptly made this point when asked about barriers that had been encountered:

> None, except that old refrain "Time."

A somewhat larger proportion (18%) indicated that they were hindered by financial concerns:

> I think the Ministry should agree to pay a man for the maintenance and to open and close. The public would like to use the school without having to pay anything.

Another barrier which is linked somewhat to the two previous concerns was a lack of leadership. One-fifth of the respondents (21%) said that their programs were inadequately supervised or understaffed. Some such difficulties were:

> Selecting the personable parent who is committed to serve.

> ...lack of leadership for teen-age groups and feeling (negative) in community toward them - not many people have the courage to meet and treat these individuals as equals.

Another one-tenth of the respondents were unable to meet all of the community's demands because of a lack of facilities or because of inappropriate facilities:

> We have no gym and no classrooms with large enough furniture for adults to be seated.

> Schools should be constructed to give access to a specific area of use in the school (i.e. library, gymnasium, etc.) without the complete plant to be used. This would curb damage and would allow custodial staff to do the required work.

A substantial number of respondents (17%) indicated that resistance was encountered in quarters other than in the community at large. Successful programs may be jeopardized if the local Board or the school staff (including the Principal, caretakers, and teachers) refuses or is unwilling to offer its support and encouragement:

> The Board of Education has not yet realized the need for more custodians, and for more funds in the maintenance budget.

One-fifth of the respondents (21%) cited problems that could be more readily rectified or problems that were a function of the immediate circumstances. These included general administrative problems and others related to being still in the early stages of development.

Some schools have experienced few or no barriers. 15% of the respondents indicated that this was the case at their school.

Another question asked respondents to indicate the direction in which they perceived their community school to be moving. Our intention was to elicit comments regarding future plans and perhaps future goals. (Table 162)

Three-quarters of the schools in the survey responded to this question. Of these, the largest proportion (48%) indicated that they were attempting to further involve the community in the school, either by increasing the use of facilities or by relying more on community resources. A substantial number of people (16%) said they were moving toward increased involvement of the school in the community. This may include the provision of daycare, pre-school and other services to the community.

An additional one-third (37%) indicated a non-specific change of emphasis. They cited, for example, a general growth or expansion of their programs, or on the other hand a stagnation and waning of interest.

Over one-tenth of the respondents (12%) said that they were striving for increased or improved communication and school. Some schools had initiated, or had made plans to initiate, a Community Council which might achieve this end.

A few individuals (3%) replied that there was a need to contend with community apathy. Plans were being made to develop programs which would increase motivation and participation.

Just over one-tenth (12%) of the respondents indicated that they had made no change of direction.

Table 162: Direction of Community Schools

n = 204

NR = 25%

	Number	Percent
No change	24	11.8
Non-specific change of emphasis	75	36.8
More involvement of community in school	98	48.0
More involvement of school in community	33	16.2
More and better communication	25	12.3
Dealing with community motivation	7	3.4
Other	2	1.0

(Note: There may be more than 100% response in this table since schools could mention several items.)

Summary of Findings

Community schools in our sample were more likely to be small schools than large ones and much more likely to be elementary schools than secondary. They were about equally likely to be rural as urban. The schools were situated throughout most parts of the province of Ontario.

The data show that the establishment of community schools is a recent, and growing, phenomenon. Most of these schools were established in the 1970s.

Important persons in the initial establishment of the community-oriented program were the school Principal (primarily) and interested parents or other community members. A perceived or expressed need by school and/or community for each others' resources seemed to be an essential factor of initiation as well.

Initial goals of the community schools tended to fall into the following areas of concern: satisfying community needs, improving communications, becoming part of the community, maximizing use of facilities, and tapping community resources. These goals have not changed much over time. Most schools were quite positive when assessing their success in meeting their goals.

These schools tended to be rather isolated from other community schools. Only about a quarter have visited other schools with similiar programs.

In many of these cases, however, they have travelled considerable distances in order to gain relevant information.

Community schools offered a highly diversified range of programs. Nearly all schools had some type of volunteer programs during the regular school program. Most commonly, parents or community members were working in libraries or teaching areas or giving occasional assistance.

About half of the schools had involvement of the community in an advisory capacity with regards to the daytime program. As well, about a third reported that students were involved through the school in community work.

The great majority of the schools (80%) offered recreational and/or educational programs for children, and most (68%) had similiar programs for adults. These took place after hours or on weekends. In addition, three-quarters of the schools reported that their facilities (gym, classrooms, library) were open to the public for their use.

About one-quarter of the schools offered some type of special services (medical, dental, legal, daycare, etc.) within the school and a slightly larger proportion of the schools had participated in one or more neighbourhood improvement projects (e.g clean-up, construction of playgrounds, etc.).

Schools in our sample tended not to restrict themselves to just one or two of the activities mentioned above. Two-thirds of them were involved in four to six of these areas of involvement.

Most of the schools took an active role in monitoring the community's feelings in planning for future programs and activities. This was done formally (e.g. surveys) or informally (the "grapevine"). Nearly all schools used some form of bulletin to provide information to the community. This was seen as definitely the most effective method of reaching a large number of people

About half of the schools reported that they had a core group of individuals, such as an advisory council, to oversee the community program. These tended to have been formed quite recently - within the last few years. Most were not overly formal - only a quarter had drawn up constitutions. The school Principal and one or more parents were nearly always included in the membership. Many schools had all types of other members as well (students, teachers, community members).

Similarly, close to half of the schools indicated that there was a single person, such as a community school worker, who was in charge of the community school program.

A great many of the schools (65%) reported that the regular school staff worked after-hours helping with community school programs. Most adult and children's programs had fewer than 10 people working as instructors or supervisors. Many of these people, particularly those working in adult programs, were paid.

The Board of Education was by far the most frequently mentioned source of funding (64%). Another main source was fees from members or users. About a third of the respondents mentioned raising money through activities such as sales and drives. Funds collected from these sources were used most often for supplies for the community school. Other expenses that were very common were salary allowances (46%) and maintenance costs (35%).

Most respondents (three-quarters) felt that community use of the school served as a deterrent to vandalism. Only a small number (5%) thought that it encouraged willful damage.

The most commonly cited factor contributing to the success of a community school was participant support. Staff and administrative support was mentioned almost as often (53%). Another key element was communication between school and community members.

Participant apathy was cited most frequently as a barrier to success (38%). Other factors mentioned less often were the lack of time, funds, and leadership, and inadequate supervision and staffing.

The final result concerns the direction in which respondents perceived their community school to be moving. Most (48%) indicated that they were trying to involve the community further in the school. About a third indicated a non-specific change of emphasis (e.g. growth or expansion). Some were moving toward increased involvement of the school in the community (16%), improved communication between community and school (12%) or trying to deal with community apathy and lack of motivation (3%).

Our survey then summarizes the activities of 271 Board-identified community schools across Ontario. The wide range of our results and the high degree of diversity in responses suggest that experimentation and development are still very much a norm for Ontario's community schools. Optimism and energy seem to be major sources of support for these schools. As one respondent expressed it:

> We strongly believe in the "community school concept." We are still pioneering in this area. We have many unanswered questions and true concerns.

No amount of optimism and energy alone can overcome all of the difficulties that schools with community involvement must face in our complex world. Organization and planning seem to be necessities as well. Such requirements as funds, custodial care, and appropriate programming must be anticipated and accounted for. Where inadequate provision for these is made in the planning of the activities, our results suggest that, almost inevitably, they will emerge later as problems. Problems such as these, and other aspects of the operation of a community school, are further explored in the three case-studies which follow. The overall implications drawn from the survey data and from the case-studies are discussed in Part III.

11 Case Studies of Community Schools

Introduction

A second part of our work has been the examination of community education programs in specific sites. Sites were selected using two criteria: the community school settings should reflect the demographic characteristics of Ontario (e.g. rural, urban, stable, transitory); the program and its organization should be such that they would illustrate concerns presently facing community educators. Accordingly, we selected one setting (elementary school) in a newly established and still rapidly growing suburb of a medium-sized city, a second setting (elementary school) in a rural area, and a third setting (secondary school) in an established area of a metropolitan region. The school in the suburban area was seen as a case-study of the process whereby a new school in a rapidly growing community of middle-to-upper income level families began to assess community concerns and to provide educational services and facilities. The rural school was to be a case-study of this process in a county setting recently affected by township amalgamation where five small village schools became one larger one. The community served by this school had two major resident types: people established for two or more generations in agriculture or a related occupation, and more recent arrivals (primarily from urban areas). The high school site in its urban setting gave us the opportunity to examine the dynamics whereby a program which had been initiated a number of years previously has continued to provide relevant community activities.

In each case, we first contacted the community school representative (the dayschool principal in all three cases) and outlined our proposal.

The second step was to discuss the study with representatives of the community education program. The final step was to seek formal approval at the Board level. Because of the nature of the data which we required and methodologies which we planned to use, we anticipated the need to establish a relationship based on mutual respect and trust. Accordingly, we sought the support of each group involved in the program. This approach had the further advantage of permitting each person contacted to specify those issues affecting the program she/he considered most salient. Data were gathered using participant observation, interviews and content analysis of reports. At least three visits to each site were made. The final summary of the data was examined by ther pertinent community school representative(s) to safeguard against misinterpretations.

SUBURBAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

This school is located within a rapidly growing new subdivision of a medium sized city. The school itself is new, having been opened in the early 1970s. It is a large elementary school encompassing grades K to 8.

The particular interest of this school, from the point of view of community involvement, is its Community School Association. This section of our study focusses on the workings of that group. At the time of our contact with the school, the Association was in its third year of operation. During its first year of operation it had experienced considerable success. More recently, however, a number of problems had beset the Association. Although these problems were somewhat varied in their specific aspects, a common theme underlying many of them was that of lack of guidance and lack of clarity as to the Association's role and function. In fact, the group had decided to suspend activities for a few months, in the hope that some of these problems could be solved in the interim.

It was during this period of inoperation that we interviewed members of the Association. The interviews were held individually, or in small groups of two or three members. They took place in members' homes or, in some cases, at their place of work. Nine members of the Association were interviewed. Two of them had occupied the chairperson's position at some time. One person was an ex-member. The interviews were conducted according to a standard format, a copy of the items being given to the person(s) being interviewed. The interviews were recorded on audio tapes and were later transcribed. All quotes which appear in this report have been selected from these transcriptions.

We should point out that our contact with the Community School Association was not limited to this set of interviews. During the previous year, as part of a related research project, we had attended a number of the Executive's meetings. By the time of the formal interviews, which were intended to gather information for the present study, we had considerable contact with members of the Association. We feel that we had developed a good relationship with them. Certainly, they were open and candid in their remarks about their organization and its problems.

It should be emphasized that the present study is based entirely on the viewpoints of the members of the Community School Association, and does not attempt to give other perspectives - such as those of the Board of Education or the school administration. This is not to deny the importance of the latter's points of view, which, we feel, must be taken into account for an overall systematic understanding of what happened at this school. However, the limitations of time and space prevent us from making these explorations at the present time. We feel that the single-perspective approach taken is a valuable one, provided its limitations are fully understood by the reader.

All of the members of the Community School Association (hereafter referred to as the C.S.A.) were, or had been, parents of children attending the school. It appeared that they were, in addition, community service-oriented individuals, who were active in other ways beside their involvement on the C.S.A.

The origin of the C.S.A. appears to have been rooted in a highly active Home and School Association at another area school. A few years previously, prior to the opening of the new school, most of the members of the C.S.A. had been active in that organization. When the new school opened, their children along with the Principal of this other school were transferred to it.

The Principal had had, for some time, a great interest in community involvement. Soon after the move to the new school, he had some discussions with a similarly interested Area Superintendent about the possible organization of a new type of parents' association. This resulted in an exploratory meeting involving representatives of the area Community College and of the Faculty of Education as resource persons. Parents were also invited to this panel discussion, which presented alternative ideas for the organization of an association.

People were invited to form an executive and about a dozen parents volunteered enthusiastically. Different members were interested in different sorts of activities and a number of committees were set up.

A committee for "in-school activities" was formed to establish parent volunteer programs at the school. However, some members of the C.S.A. wanted to be more community-oriented than this. Accordingly, they established an "out-of-school" committee. This was to explore such possibilities as:

> How can we use the school, its facilities, its building, whatever it has in the line of equipment, for community use.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

Liaisons with the Township Council and with the Board of Education were established as well.

Membership on the Executive included, as well, a teacher representative and the Principal. The entire Association was considered, by executive members, to include all members of the community surrounding the school.

The Association was formed enthusiastically and quickly organized itself for a variety of purposes. However, in retrospect, some members felt that it had lacked guidance and a strong sense of direction:

> I think one of the big problems in the C.S.A. was that we all had different ideas of what it should do... We set [it] up with very little sort of leadership [as to] what was expected from us... which is fine. We felt that we were serving our own school so why should we follow anyone else's rules and regulations.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

The Association was highly active in its first year. A Fun Fair was held, raising a considerable amount of money which was spent on new things for the school. A survey of the community was taken and, from this information, a number of "mini-courses" were set up. These were well attended, particularly by children. Parents were helping out in the school library, working in the office and assisting with the school program. As a result of the Association's action the Township put up some stop signs and built a cement walk at the school.

Some members of the Association commented that too many different things were being attempted at once:

> ...we spread ourselves too thin. We dabbled in all sorts of little things; nobody knew what they were doing, and advice from any 'powers that be' [Board officials] was very, very shortcoming.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

There were problems of jurisdiction. The C.S.A. members were unsure of the extent to which their decisions would be carried out:

> We had sub-committees, but no power whatsoever... That was one of our biggest problems. We couldn't do anything if we didn't have the power. If they say "no," well, what is the use of doing it. So I think there should have been rules brought down beforehand, what you could get into and what you couldn't get into.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

In an attempt to clarify its role, the C.S.A. undertook the development of a constitution. This established formal rules of procedure and placed limits on possibly types of activities. However, the constitution was seen by many members as an unfortunate development which caused many difficulties:

> We got waylaid by a constitution which...is complete nonsense for any group starting from scratch...because you tie yourself to this constitution, hook, line and sinker, and time and time again you think - gee, if we only didn't have this, we could do that. I think we might have been wiser not to have bothered with anything so formal in the early stages and just plodded along and sorted things out for ourselves.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

> We obtained a constitution by leeching parts of various other community school constitutions. In the end it strangled us...our meetings became too formal...our constitution was restricting us to various things and that is where the disagreement started as to whom we should be serving and how we could best serve them.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

While members of the Association felt a need for clearer guidelines, particularly with regards to the extent of their authority, the Constitution worked to restrict them in ways they found undesirable:

> The constitution is there to aid the people, not to strangle. The society should be flexible enough to change its attention at the drop of a hat.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

In the absence of real guidelines, some misunderstandings were unavoidable. One instance of this concerned the "out-of-school" committee. The committee organized some community surveys and tried to set up programs to satisfy the needs which were expressed in the survey results. In the process of this, some communication with the Board of Education's Continuing Education Branch was undertaken. However, the relative jurisdictions of the C.S.A. and of the Board had not been clarified. The job description of the Board's Coordinator of Continuing Education encompassed the same type of things the C.S.A. was trying to do. A number of the Association members were unhappy about the way that their respective roles were defined:

> It was handled at the time very badly... We spent an awful lot of blood, sweat and tears trying to organize some form of activity with negotiations back and forth to the School Board...only to find that the Coordinator of Continuing Education had done it anyway, and it was a complete lack of communication.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

C.S.A. members had worked very hard to set up these courses and suddenly found that the Board had taken over this function. While this, in principle, was seen as desirable, the actual process seems to have caused hard feelings:

> I am quite sure that it was our pushing in the first place that instigated the program anyway. It was the way that it was taken over that...was badly handled... We, as parents, had worked to arrive at certain things -

> the needs in the area; we tried to supply these needs - and then all of a sudden the Board of Education is doing it.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

The Association had been under the impression that they were free to allocate school areas for after-hours use. However, this turned out not to be true. They would allocate a certain space only to find that there had been a previous claim on it - made through the Board of Education:

> We suggested that room in the school be given to the clubs, and we found out that the other people were applying to the Board, and the Board was granting them - rather than granting by the C.S.A. We thought we had been given the responsibility for allocating space but this never occurred. The School Board said they should have the final say...so it became an exercise in futility to even consider these matters.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

This lack of precise communication with the Board proved to be a source of other difficulties:

> We would decide on doing something one way only to find out that it was actually being organized another way. When it was being organized - the actual evening of registration, for example - you'd go to the school and find out that no-one was there. We hadn't been told that people were wanted and yet it was expected from us. There was very poor liaison.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

During the Association's second year, there were still many activities. The C.S.A. was meeting regularly each month. Parent volunteers were still working in the school, although the C.S.A. felt that their communication with the teaching staff had deteriorated:

> I began to get the feeling last year: I wondered whether the teachers are really for this community school? Do they want it there? - I never had any confirmation, I just didn't know how the teachers felt.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

Two successful Fun Fairs as well as a Winter Carnival were held. There were children's activities after school and on weekends. Generally, the same kinds of activities were taking place as during the first year of operation. However, the C.S.A. was receiving less attention for these services. Not many new things were happening. The Board of Education, with its Continuing Education program, had largely taken over the "out-of-school" committee's function.

Morale among C.S.A. members was beginning to fall. By January a few members had resigned. The Association decided to hold a series of discussions about their problems and to try to come up with solutions. They attempted to revise their constitution.

One item among these revisions concerned the role of the Principal. Whereas he had been functioning as a resource person without a vote; he was now given full voting membership:

> He considered himself in an advisory capacity and this is great. The only thing was that in staying in this position after a great deal of discussion, he felt that he shouldn't vote or sway anything in any way. We all felt this was bad. He should have an equal voice in it...and bring up ideas as well as make amendments.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

A number of the members commented about a certain awkwardness in their relations with the Principal during C.S.A. meetings and in related communications. It seemed as if their normally easy-going relationships with him were impossible to carry over into the formal tone of the organization's business:[1]

> I think [the Principal] had his worries and his doubts about certain things and he obviously didn't feel like exerting himself in certain areas...because he felt, "If I push too much, they might resent it" - and I think some of the parents felt the same way. In fact, it all sort of falls down to the question of really not knowing where each other stands. He was hesitant because we were the parents and we were hesitant because he was the Principal. There was a breakdown of communication on quite a number of things, even though on a personal basis I can talk to [the Principal] until the cows come home...
>
> (C.S.A. member)

---

[1] This problem in communication was probably a result of the Principal and the association members beginning to relate to each other in different capacities and under different circumstances.

The revisions made in the constitution proved to be of little effect in reviving the Association's falling morale. A number of meetings during which various problems of the Association were discussed also failed to be of real help. There seemed to be many sources of difficulty and of friction, but perhaps the greatest problem was the lack of success of the group in enlisting new membership. The same small group of parents - many of whom had been active on a previous Home and School group as well - had continued to come to meetings and to head the committees. Despite repeated requests to the community, no new members were forthcoming and the existing members were losing their original energy and impetus:

> There are people who won't bother. They say the job is being done, so why bother? You also find when you are on a committee of this nature and you are on that committee for two or three years, you can't get anybody else on, no matter what you do. You find that the criticism of what you are doing is getting harder and harder to bear. You get resentful...you are not prepared to take criticism any more, because you think - "I am the only one who is doing anything." This is human nature; you get a little bit of a martyr as you go along...
>
> (C.S.A. member)

The rapidly growing nature of the subdivision, along with the high percentage of families where both parents were working, and the transient population, were generally blamed for this lack of interest in participation on the Association. Some members felt that the very fact of the formal organization with title and constitution was an intimidating thing for possible new members.

Different priorities held by existing members were another source of trouble. Some members were more interested in programs for children whereas others wanted adult programs. Some wanted to help out in the daytime school, while others were more oriented toward the out-of-school aspect of the activities. Since space was limited, competition became inevitable.

The Association members heard that the Board of Education was in the process of designing a set of guidelines for community schools. This was seen as a highly desirable thing and possibly a new source of ideas on how to organize and maintain the Association. Since the guidelines would be several months in the making, the C.S.A. voted to suspend their activities in the meantime.

During our interviews, we asked C.S.A. members about the advice they would give to other similar groups just starting out. Again and again, the need for strong guidelines was mentioned:

> We can't set up our own guidelines, we have to have guidelines approved by the Board.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

Members emphasized that lack of guidelines had not meant freedom to do as they saw necessary. They felt they had laboured under a false impression of having more authority than they were, in fact, allowed to exercise:

> We were eager and bright-eyed...and were raring to go and we ran into a wall. If we had known it was there, we might have approached things differently - maybe would not have gone at them so we would get hit, but stayed low or gone around it...
>
> (C.S.A. member)

This desire for clear guidelines is not necessarily a desire for more power:

> I don't think it's a power struggle. I think it's just a lack of knowing. If we knew what exactly they wanted us to do, or what they would let us do, we could have gone on with our job.
>
> (C.S.A. member)

At the time of our study, the Board's guidelines were being formulated. Although some members of the C.S.A. expressed disappointment at not being asked to participate in the actual formation of the guidelines, most were eagerly awaiting the document in the hope of finding some solutions to the problems they were experiencing.

In terms of the lessons that other similar groups may learn from the experience of the C.S.A., the clear specification of roles would seem to be of great benefit. What, exactly, are the aims of the group and how will it attempt to accomplish these? Relations with the school Principal, the daytime staff, and the Board of Education should all be clarified in terms of areas of jurisdiction. Apart from this, members should try to avoid overly committing themselves early in the life of the association.

One or two functions well accomplished would seem preferable to the "spreading ourselves too thin" that one C S.A. member referred to. Some type of two-way system of communication with the surrounding community would be another highly desirable thing. This might deflect the martyr syndrome that overworked Association members may fall into, while, at the same time, helping to bring new members into the group. The too early formalization of the group (i.e. constitution, formal title) would be another thing to avoid.

In closing, any new group would benefit by listening to these recommendations made by one member of the C.S.A.:

> Have something specific in mind. Know what you want and find out if it is something other people want as well, and go after it. Don't start saying: "Well, Mrs. Jones down the road wants something else." The hell with Mrs. Jones down the road; go after what you want...and if you find that you are not the only one who thinks positively about [it], go after it. Succeed on that, then say: "What else is there, what is the next thing to do? One thing at a time. Don't spread yourself too thin and find out exactly what your rights are as far as the school, parents, children and the Board of Education... If you know exactly what you are allowed to do and not allowed to do, then you can come up with the thing that you want, and say: "We want this, and you'd better give us a good reason why we can't have it...."

RURAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The school was built in 1971 and absorbed five small one-to-three-room schools. It draws from four rural townships. Virtually all students are bussed in. The student population, grades K to 8, is approximately 250.

The school is interesting from our viewpoint in that it illustrates how a rural school drawing from several small communities began to promote community involvement. Our contacts with the school covered a six-month period, although most of our data came from three sets of extensive interviews involving the Principal, the school secretary, and the custodian. The researchers, through their previous year's study, had had contacts with the school. We were well known to the school people and were generally familiar with their community programs. We felt that they had confidence in our work and that they were quite open when discussing the problems and satisfactions related to being a "community school." Formal interviews were conducted in a group situation with the Principal, secretary and custodian. As well, the Principal was interviewed individually. The Board Co-ordinator of Continuing and Community Education was also interviewed individually. The interviews followed a standard format and were audio-taped to be transcribed later. We also attended one of the community activity nights.

While one might identify the Principal as the key individual in initiating and promoting community involvement at this school this would not be fully accurate. First it should be noted that the secretary, custodian and Principal were "native" to the area. They were all familiar with the life styles of the area people. Each had worked in the general area previous to coming to the new school, e.g. the Principal had been Principal of one of the small schools which had been amalgamated, the secretary had worked in the municipal office. Each wanted the area people to use the school's resources and, perhaps the key factor, each respected the others' opinions and commitments.

It was in this climate that the school opened and the idea of community involvement began. Although it is not a conventional researcher observation, perhaps one common feature of these individuals was their propensity to go beyond the usual job requirements without additional remuneration. The motivation?

> We had a new school here and people should use it.
>
> (Custodian)

> In community affairs or community life it just is not right for you to shut doors... If you like people and if you like to see them have things then you automatically accept the extra workload.
>
> (Secretary)

> I have grown up in the area and knowing the area really well believe that they should have a place to use. I can recall wishing many a time that we were closer to the high schools so you would be able to get things you need - go back to the library or a shop... I want to see these sorts of things made available.
>
> A second objective was to draw together, through the programs of the school, the people of our four small communities.
>
> (Principal)

The concept of the community school was not formalized until January, the fifth month of the school's existence. The Principal organized a public meeting to discuss the feasibility of establishing a community school. The Board of Education's Continuing Education Coordinator, the Ministry of Education's Regional Community Schools Consultant, and the Community Education Officer for the local community college attended the meeting, playing an active part. Those at the meeting were enthusiastic about the idea and a steering committee was established. The major focus was to investigate how the school could be a resource to the local communities. The committee was made up of locally prominent people (e.g. merchant, clergyman, municipal representative), as well as more typical community members. The Principal and secretary were also members. The committee members "seemed to not enjoy the prospect of discussing philosophy and objectives. They wanted to get down to practical things and get programs going and become immediately involved."

This steering committee became the Community School Council. Although the Council did not see the need for a formal constitution (and still did not at the time of the survey), they did agree that the program should be based on the following four objectives:

- to establish an opportunity for people to enjoy themselves socially while acquiring further skills
- to draw together, through the programs of the community school, the people of (the five communities)
- to promote more use of the school
- to be aware of changes in the educational process in order to advise and make recommendations from a community viewpoint and to relay information to the general public.

According to the key people at the school, the objectives were met. They were seen as still applicable although there was agreement that there should be an annual review involving the school staff and the members of the community. The general feeling reflected by all with whom we talked was that the school was there, that it had space and equipment which could be used in a great many ways by the people of the community - the Principal and the teachers could and would suggest ways - there was no need to write it all down. Unlike the case of the suburban school's community school association, there did not seem to be an expectation or a concern that the Council should determine specific programs or set priorities regarding use of facilities - this was left up to the three school persons.

It must be kept in mind, however, that these three people had always lived in the area and had a deep understanding of its people. This situation is quite different from one where school and community people have different backgrounds. The Principal stated that the critical variable as he saw it was the school peoples' knowledge of the community. He saw the community school's prime function as one of service - or filling currently unmet needs. His position was that if the community did not require a community school program, there should not be one. On this basis, he recommended that the person considering such a program must become intimate with the community:

> What has it to offer? What service clubs, what facilities? The [the person] would have to discuss [the matter] with the community...
>
> (Principal)

We asked how one became familiar with the community:

> I would get out to any type of group setting I possibly could, as well as just talking to people. I would hit any service club, church groups. Students certainly should be included ...students in a very short order can tell you what is needed in a community.
>
> (Principal)

Periodically surveys were sent to the people of the community. The survey, in general, took the form of an option sheet from which the Council developed an inventory of interests. The inventory was updated through the school secretary's recording "everything a person has ever expressed interest in...some things that people just out of normal conversation have suggested or students have suggested in class." From time to time, the secretary read possible community school activities at the regular school's assembly. Students communicated these to their parents. The Council developed its programs from the inventory.

Surveys were sent to every household including those which did not have children in school. Newspapers were used as well to inform parents of proposed activities. Telephone calls were made to householders who did not respond to the surveys.

Resource people (e.g. instructors, regular classroom volunteers, and assistants) had not been a major problem in operating the program. Again because of their knowledge of the community people, Council members, particularly the secretary and the Principal, would invite specific individuals to take charge. As well "sometimes people will just walk in and say, look I can do these things. Then they will whip up support... the students make suggestions here as well" (Secretary). Some of the regular staff members assisted with the community school program. All instructors were paid. Participants in the community school program were primarily parents of the area. By 1975 there was an increasing number of people who had no direct link to the school. As well, high school aged students and students from the day school program took part.

The community school activities varied widely. One of the early activities involved school-community exchange visits - one to Newfoundland and a second to Quebec. Both day-school students and other community members made the visits. Funds were raised through local initiative although much of the work seemed to have been coordinated by the secretary. Evening programs range from courses relating to farming practices, hobby development, physical fitness, "academic courses," to general interest and personal growth courses (guitar, ballet, leather craft, antiques). Some day programs were attempted, but even with daycare provided few people became involved. Community social functions occurred at the school.

One feature of this community school was the reciprocal relation between the community and the school. For example, one group used the school one night per week for a social function; in return the group operated the outdoor hockey rink in winter and made other donations to the regular school program. More indirectly, those attending the social functions became aware of various aspects of both the regular and the community school's programs. The three school people pointed out that with this general awareness, interest and a willingness to support and to become involved could develop.

The major factor contributing to the current success of this community school program seemed to be its sensitivity to the community. Because of its relative isolation from other parts of the county, it tended to maintain an independence from what might be called bureaucratic procedures. If funds were required, they could be raised locally. If people were needed for an activity, they (in most instances) could be found locally. As the secretary expressed it:

> Our enthusiasm was so great that everyone volunteered to do everything...we were not even aware that we could have hired some part-time people.
>
> (Secretary)

At the time of the final interview the County Board had appointed a committee to formulate guidelines leading toward an official Board policy regarding community use of schools. Such a policy was seen as potentially limiting in so far as it would regulate use and conditions of use (e.g. rental fees, custodial services, etc.) of the school facilties. The school people felt that community people would no longer volunteer if they saw some resource people or assistants being paid in other parts of the County, particularly if they had to rent space or equipment for their use; as well, they would be unlikely to continue to donate their personal time and energy to support school-community activities (e.g. preparation of food for two exchange visits, fund-raising activities).

The school group felt that as long as there were only guidelines established by the Board and not a formulation of policy, their activities would continue. A basic concern was that of areas of jurisdiction - who had the authority and the responsibility to set up a course or activity for the community in the school and/or to permit a group to use a school facility or resource? Up to the time of writing the community school leaders had acted relatively independently of Board officials and administrators. They saw their mandate with the community. Simply, they saw the school being used for the community and by the community.

The school group did not want blanket policies which would set areas of jurisdiction or would prescribe specific tasks and responsibilities for the various Board officials, the day school Principal and staff, and the community school group. Their wish was to be informed of the various Board supports available and to have an input into decisions which affected their own situation.

URBAN SECONDARY SCHOOL

The school is located in a long-established residential area of one of Ontario's metropolitan centres. The population is relatively stable. At the time of writing (spring 1975) the day-school student population was diminishing somewhat.

This school offers an opportunity to examine the role of the Community Council in organizing community programs and in coordinating community use of school facilities. It also provides us with the possibility of exploring why this particular council was able to remain in operation over a relatively long period of time.

We made three visits to the school. One visit was with the school Principal, Board official, and the Recreation Coordinator. The second involved the Principal and the Coordinator. The third was with the Community Council during one of its meetings. Data were gained through examinations of official documents and records (e.g. constitution, historical account of the Community Council and its work, annual reports) and interviews with key persons throughout data collection. The Coordinator, the Principal, and the Council members talked freely and openly about both successes and problems with the program.

This school had a long tradition of community members using many of its facilities. Indeed, the land on which the school was built was originally a municipal playground. The Municipality leased the land to the Board of Education on the condition that it continue to provide a public playground during both winter and summer comparable to that offered by the Municipal Recreation Department. The school decided that the community should also have use of the indoor facilities and this led to the formation of the Community Council. The school's first Principal was a strong believer in the idea of community involvement. The Board of Education supported this by establishing the full-time position of a recreation coordinator.

In the 25-year history of community school activities at this high school, there had been some 7 or 8 coordinators: this role was certainly central to the success and longevity of community activities. The coordinator was hired by the Board of Education and was considered to be a member of the school staff. He had no teaching responsibilities; his duties were centred entirely around the community school program. The school's Principal was consulted in his hiring. The coordinator had his office in the school and was well known to most of the school's staff.

The coordinator worked full-time with the Community Council program. He held the position of secretary on the Council and was the only permanent member of the executive. Programs offered by the Council were generally of a recreational nature. There was indoor activities for the general community as well as a summer playground and winter ice-rink.

The Council membership had changed over the years from one which took its membership from community organizations to one of activity group representatives (hockey, baseball, folk dancing, etc.) to "co-opted" members (i.e. individuals recommended by Council). This last seemed to provide continuity. That is, if, for example, a badminton group started with the support of one leader, a Council member could have a replacement provided by Council's invitation should he/she need to leave the area.

Relatively early in the community school's history, a constitution was developed. This had had six constitutional amendments. From the outset the foremost objective was to provide a broad recreational program of "social activities, athletics, arts and crafts, cultural activities, and seasonal events in keeping with the interests and aspirations of all members of the community."[1] The objectives did not include conventional academic activities.

Although initially the Council provided activities geared to both adults and children, in recent years the adult programs had been largely subsumed under the Continuing Education programs offered by the Board of Education. Programs offered by the Council and those provided by the Continuing Education Department were entirely independent.

The Board set priorities for school facility use: (1) the day-school program (grades 9 - 13) needs; (2) the Board's continuing education needs; (3) Community Council programs; (4) general public or private group needs. After the requirements of the regular and continuing education programs were met, the Community Council had full autonomy in allocating space and other resources so long as there was no interference with the first two groups.

During a typical week at this high school, day-school programs, adult education programs, and the Community Council's activities often operated simultaneously and with little evidence of mutual interference. The coordinator's role appeared to be central to this co-operation. His position as a member of the school staff enabled him to have a clear appreciation of the needs and priorities of the day-school programs. When difficulties arise, these were usually settled immediately and without resorting to the use of external administrative channels.

We discussed the Community Council and its program with the Principal of the high school and the community school coordinator. Constitutionally, the Council was accountable directly to the Board and makes arrangements (e.g., for a specific group to begin a program) directly with the Board. The Principal received a copy of the agreement but was not actively involved. This requires an open relationship between the regular school staff and its community users and again emphasizes the importance of the role of coordinator.

---

[1] Community Council Constitution and By-Laws pg. 1.

The Council was responsible for seeing that each activity undertaken within their jurisdiction was economically sound. For example, a group wishing a program of community theatre had to submit a statement showing the number to be involved, registration fees to be charged, the sort of equipment to be purchased, and the length of time required. Each group had to submit 15% of their gross income to the Council, which could use this as revenue to support other activities. The latter were primarily youth programs, or other recent programs which might temporarily be running a deficit. Each group submitted monthly financial statements. There was a rental fee charged to those groups which used the school facilities through Council auspices. The Council and its community groups did receive, however, a "preferred rate" (less than what the Board would charge private or other non-council users).

The entire Council of approximately 20 persons met bi-monthly; in addition the executive met on one occasion between general meetings. We attended one meeting of the Council.

All with whom we talked agreed that the Council programs were successful. Factors like longevity, increasing participation trends for both adults and young children, and program diversity attest to this. This does not mean, however, that the Council was without its problems. A major and recurring problem was that of finding enough active volunteers to conduct the various aspects of each program. This was particularly true of youth programs, where there was a chronic need for people to assist with registration, coaching, fund raising, etc. Our perception was that each Council member assumed responsibility for at least one specific activity. Usually the member had a personal interest changed (e.g., child "outgrew" the activity), the member moved to other areas or retired from the Council. Replacements were difficult to find.

Council members generally agreed that communication ineffectiveness with the community was at the root of the problem. They saw a large number of people living in the community unaware of the programs or of the facilities. A number of methods had been attempted to provide information: newspaper, bulletins, media kits. Because of the great cost involved and the limited response, the Council members saw these as relatively ineffective. The most common method of recruiting new members seems to have been through personal contacts at social or business events. The co-ordinator was active in most community events, e.g., civic organizations, clubs, church groups, etc., and had demonstrated a readiness to listen to and support a group in initiating an activity.

A second and related problem seems to have been a tendency for the Council members to work individually. That is, individuals seemed to take responsibility for carrying out a given activity. In hockey, for example, one Council member would be in charge of player registration, arranging team groupings, obtaining coaches, sponsors, timetabling, etc. While this was effective in that one person assumed full responsibility, the absence of written routines and their sequence, and task descriptions, made it difficult for the activity to be carried on without that member's full involvement. The coordinator, of course, provided much assistance and in a number of cases carried the major responsibility himself. Because of his extensive and varied work load the specifics of routines and procedures were not recorded for some other individual to use at a future time. Routines, schedules, resource directories, etc., remained relatively idiosyncratic and were communicated orally. A similar observation was made during our meeting with the co-ordinator and the Principal: the particular program seemed to be dependent upon the personalities of the incumbents.

At the time of our visit with the Council, members came to the meeting on time, well informed about their particular responsibility. We found each Council member fully involved and committed to her/his own task and to the general functioning of the Council. An agenda had been sent out before the meeting, brief written accounts (membership, financial statement, current activities/concerns) were prepared on behalf of each activity group. The meeting itself was effectively chaired, with each member taking an active part throughout the meeting. When the group attempted to arrange committee meetings, it became apparent that each member seemed to have "multi-involvements" in the community, e.g., memberships in citizen, social and business or work groups, and that many of these involvements were of a leadership nature. The question arises, if there were written descriptions of tasks, including the delineation of specific procedures, would member replacement remain a problem? With detailed guidelines, would and could more inexperienced individuals carry out the various responsibilities?

Relations between the Community Council and the daytime school were characterized mainly by co-operation. One example of this was the recent practice of complementary purchasing of equipment. Originally, the Community Council was to provide its own "extra" materials and was to budget accordingly. Now there was some informal sharing of budgets. If, for example, one Council activity group wished to have archery, and the school had no archery equipment but the P.H.E. department felt that there could be school use made of such equipment, the group could purchase the equipment and the P.H.E. classes might use it. In return, a group of children might use the school's basketball and volleyball equipment.

Community participant complaints or concerns about facilities (e.g., equipment the group had arranged to use not being made available) were handled directly by the coordinator, the Council, and the Principal or appropriate staff member. As far as we could see, problems and issues were resolved within the community-school organization.

Vandalism was not a greater problem than in other schools in the area. Whether or not this can be attributed to the extensive community use of the school was not known. On any Saturday there were many, many young children; weekly and weekends evening activities brought in mainly adults. (There were about 500-600 persons in the Council activities.) Programs for teenagers were less successful. The Principal suggested that the area teens might see the building as High School and so did not like to return to it during their free time. He felt also that there were competing forms of entertainment for the teens. One difficulty with programs for older teens was to get volunteers to assist or supervise.

One problem which had not yet been worked out was the lack of a maintenance allowance for such a large community user group (about 2000 beyond the regular school population). One specific example was: "How can you purchase toilet paper for 3500 people when the budget allows for only 1500?" The repair budget was also inadequate, although this was in the process of being resolved. The Principal, the relevant department head, and the coordinator began to assess the portion of time used by school and by community - the repair bill budgets were adjusted accordingly.

Overall, then, this community school program was highly successful in the context of its objectives. One major factor contributing to this success seemed to be the division of the overall program into three specific areas - the regular grades 9 to 13 daytime school program area, the continuing and adult education area, and the Community Council's recreational program area. In other words, there were clear-cut and well accepted lines of jurisdiction or responsibility. With such a number of groups wishing to use the same facilities, it was helpful for an outside authority (in this case, the Board of Education), to establish and maintain functional priorities. This formal division, however, was supported by an informal network of communication which cross-cut and transcended the strictly official organization. Many teachers of the daytime program were, at the same time, leaders in community programs. Members of the school's staff were also in daily contact with the coordinator, who could pass on their points of view to the Council. He could handle, immediately and personally, any tensions which might arise through the community use of the school. Also, the school's administration was represented on the Council. This combination of formal and informal lines of communication was central to the success of the program.

Part III Implications of the School and Community

Part III Implications of the School and Community

In this final section we review the community school movement in the province and note certain implications for educators and administrators.

One potential difficulty in the community schools' movement lies not in the concept of community schools per se but rather in the way educational change in general has been approached. In the areas of educational change or modification, there seem to be two approaches or models being used. One model begins with initial fact-finding or data gathering. The facts then are examined by experts who independently or with other experts work our solutions (e.g. handbooks, guidelines) which are then disseminated, presumably providing solutions to the earlier identified problems. For purposes of this study, we will call this approach the research, development, and dissemination model (R.D.D.). The second approach or model is one in which there has been a support structure provided at the local level for those in the situation to identify their own needs, and then, still at the local level, to develop or to select their own solutions. We will call this second approach the user diagnosed and resolved model (U.D.R.). (See Fullan, 1972 and Fullan and Pomfret, 1977.) The data show that in general, principals see themselves in a situation where both models are operating simultaneously. That is, on the one hand the principal feels he/she is expected to wait until some expert or some higher authority specifies what his/her responsibilities and duties are and to define policies governing these responsibilities and duties; on the other hand, the principal feels that he/she is expected to act autonomously in determining the needs relating to the school, and to develop solutions or to identify ready-made solutions and to incorporate the appropriate one(s) to resolve the issue. A variant of the U.D.R. model is one where the other "users," e.g., teachers, parents, and students, are involved with the principal in the diagnosing, developing, selecting, resolving, and decision-making process (i.e. in the interpretation and implementation of guidelines).

Let us now examine more explicitly the implications of these models. Until recently, the Ontario Ministry of Education seems to have been following the line of decentralization, giving increasingly more autonomy to Boards and to individual schools, particularly in the areas of specific curriculum organization and practices (and public use of school facilities).

In practice, it seems that the Ministry has been providing general, almost philosophical, statements of intent. Boards have been refining these intents to principles, leaving the schools to transform these principles into action. In other words, the U.D.R. approach has become increasingly appropriate. Yet at the present time, specific events such as the specification of a core curriculum suggest that both the Ministry and individual boards now are using more central approaches.

Our surveys show that a number of principals find this situation ambiguous, particularly in the area of community-related activities where Ministry expectations in terms of practices are not always seen as clear-cut. One result is that a number of principals, community school coordinators, and liaison persons see themselves having to make efforts to involve the community, in ways ranging from the taking of courses to assisting with the regular day program to participating in school decision-making, without fully understanding the ultimate outcomes.

On the other hand, the responsibilities surrounding other aspects of the principal's role in the school are seen by principals as more clear-cut. For example, principals were more in agreement as to what their priorities should be, i.e. what they should spend much of their time doing (curriculum related activities, 75%; staff supervision and evaluation, 70%) in areas where they had decision making responsibilities. Even in these areas, however, our results show that principals are expected to play a strong role in facilitating the implementation of curriculum guidelines, but for various reasons do not devote as much time to it as they would like. Some of these reasons include lack of knowledge of how to facilitate curriculum change, ambiguities in the guidelines over what is expected, and role overload as more and more is expected of the principal. These same factors are even greater problems in the complex area of school/community programs.

When role expectations have evolved over a long period of time there are relatively few ambiguities in terms of performance. Individuals frequently may feel pressures of personal time and energy, but in general, because there is an overall clarity about what they are to do, they can carry on with relatively little specific direction from a central Ministry or a Board. On the other hand, when new sets of role expectations emerge, as in the case of school/community development, specific direction and support will be required (Sarason, 1972, Gross et al, 1971, Gross and Trask, 1976).

The problem of taking on new role expectations and performances is compounded where one considers the matter from points of view other than that of the role incumbent (here the principal). For example, there is the point of view of the school's geographic community, including parents and prospective employers of the school's students. Communication with the various members of this community has become critical. While virtually all school principals see themselves as having provided opportunities for such communication, there are a number of problems. One difficulty can arise when different expectations are communicated: the school and principal are seen as presenting one, the Board presenting a second, the Ministry through the media is seen as presenting a third. A second difficulty can arise when, because of existing commitments to the regular day program in terms of personal time, staff, space, and financial resources, the principal and the school are unable to meet expectations on the part of the public. A third problem can arise when new skills are required of the principal or community school persons in order to meet the new expectations. This latter problem is compounded when in-service training opportunities are non-existent, inadequate, or inaccessible (e.g. not available locally).

It is obvious that the role of the school principal is dynamic and changing. From our perspective and that of many principals in our study the underlying characteristic of the principal's role change currently is its additive nature. That is, new performance expectations have been added continually to an already complex role set. As well, expectations for a number of these additional performances have been created outside the school by a combination of the Ministry, School Boards, and general publics of the school.

Few would reject the principle that the school and the principal as its legal representative should be responsive to public needs. However, unlike the situation in Fisher Park Collegiate in Ottawa or in the Flint, Michigan School, where the concepts of community schools, and of principal roles and adequate support systems have evolved over 30 to 40 years, across Ontario the new roles seem to have emerged in general within the past five years (Clifford et al, 1974, 1975).

Adding to the complexity of the problem of the role change is the fact that there are two ways in which the role change has come about: the R.D.D. model and the U.D.R. model. Principals see many of these new responsibilities as being created by the actions of the Ministry and by School Boards who, directly or indirectly, have analysed certain educational phenomena, identified "solutions" and then disseminated these "solutions," (e.g. community education grants advocating increased use of school facilities and resources).

While the "solutions" themselves may not specifically define the role changes, because of the principal's traditional role responsibilities (e.g. that she/he is responsible for the school program and building), unless there is a change in the principal's priorities, the new responsibilities are added on. In addition, with the decentralization of the early 1970s and with what seems to be an overall increase in the principal's professional status, principals themselves appear to have developed new role responsibilities, particularly in the diagnosis of schooling needs and selection of means of resolving these needs. Some principals have made the situation more complex by attempting to include others (who have not conventionally taken part, e.g. parents) and to support their participation in this process. As well, in some instances, the Ministry and/or boards are seen as creating a further complexity, e.g. they are seen as promoting active community participation in the diagnosis-resolution process. Whatever the cause, when the community or segments of it begin to take part in this process, new sets of expectations and responsibilities inevitably emerge (Sarason, 1972). With the development of new expectations for and the addition of new responsibilities to an already "full" role, the whole situation tends to become increasingly ambiguous, overloaded, and directionless.

Gross et al (1971) in their analysis of the implementation of educational innovations identified two types of barriers: (1) psychological or normative barriers - e.g. the individuals who "use" the innovation are unclear as to what their new roles are, what they entail, and as a result, they lack the skills and knowledge to perform these new roles; (2) structural or mechanistic barriers - e.g. materials, equipment, and human resources are not available to support the new roles, and customary timetabling, grading practices, and routines are incompatible with the new program.

One approach to problems of this nature would have been to adopt a more directive, unilateral style (R.D.D. model). Yet as we have seen, many principals prefer (or feel that their situation requires) an approach which will involve those at the local level (U.D.R. model). Indeed as we have suggested, there seemed to have been a high level of Ministry support for this concept. At the present time, however, conditions have changed and staff reactions have changed. Charters and Pellegrin (1973) have analysed four case-studies in which there was a "staff-determined" feature.* (The specific innovation was differentiated staffing.) Although they are addressing a single school situation their conclusions are applicable to this broader situation. Briefly, they identified the following barriers:

1) Ambiguity Re the Nature of the Change - The innovation or organizational change tends to be described or referred to in abstract, global terms emphasizing benefits to be realized rather than the nature of the change itself.

---

*Collaborative decision-making with staff members accepting responsibility for making and carrying out decisions.

2) Staff Awareness of the Program Implementation Costs and Benefits - Teachers, even under conditions where they choose the situation, often have little basis for knowing the nature of the change to which they would be committing themselves, since the specific program is still to be developed; neither the costs nor the benefits can yet be assessed.

3) Staff Perception of Leaders' Support and Involvement - Where "staff-determination" is an overarching value, leaders tend to intervene as little as possible. This lack of intervention may be perceived by the staff as a lack of appropriate resource support and as the absence of psychological support from administration. Moreover the problem may arise at a later stage if the leaders who are accountable for the "success" of the school must intervene at a "crisis" stage, thereby creating strain with the staff.

4) Staff Uncertainty Re the Specific Dimensions of the Change - Members of the staff may not necessarily be clear as to what the change is. In addition, they may not be able to work this out where there are competing time demands, lack of a structure, and lack of experience in collective decision-making. For example, classroom teachers may be expected to carry out their normal time-consuming instructional duties, while simultaneously figuring out how to work with other teachers in team or committee decision-making.

5) Individual vs. Collective Responsibility - While the change implies that "they" are to become largely responsible for defining the new program, the individual staff member may be uncertain of how his responsibility can actually be carried out. Since most individuals may feel this way, there is no "collective" responsibility. This situation is compounded by point (3) above.

6) Realistic Timetable - The time schedule for implementing and carrying out the new program may be unrealistically short, exacerbating all of the above problems.

7) Unanticipated "Costs" of Implementation - Finally, the "costs" of participation (role overload, diversion from core teaching, frustration at lack of progress, lack of rewards) may begin to outweigh the benefits, and people may lose commitment and/or leave the situation.

Sarason (1972) has investigated how new settings fail to develop their innovative promises. He has specified a number of predictable problems which new settings face. Since many of Sarason's points concern the types of problems just discussed, we report his main observations briefly.

In our reading of his work, we take the following points as representing a major common problem areas that must be addressed (but usually are not) in the creation of new settings.

1) Realistic Timetable - In virtually every situation Sarason examined he found the leader or other authorities has an unrealistically short timetable within which they expected significant change to occur (1972, p. 61 - ff). Having underestimated the complexity of the change, they organized an unrealistically short timetable; people inevitably became frustrated with the lack of progress.

2) Absence of Vehicles for Criticism - Sarason (1972, pp. 74-76, 128-129) states that there is a failure to anticipate that problems will inevitably occur. The planners do not formulate ground rules and vehicles for discussion to address problems and conflicts. As a result, problems must be handled at the worst times, namely when conflict and frustration are at their highest. Sarason, explaining this failure, suggests that people begin in a mood of optimism and cannot see the need for such vehicles - they quickly become preoccupied with daily routines and tasks and little time is available for reflection and anticipation.

3) Leader's Sense of Privacy - Sarason (1972, pp. 218-223) points out that assumptions about leadership in our society ensure that "the leader will remain a private individual, particularly in regard to thoughts and feelings reflecting anxiety or self-doubt" (p. 218). He points to several consequences of this, including a sense of loneliness on the part of the leader, and problems of leader-fellow worker communication. The latter problem is due to the fact that the normative communication relationship is not open. (The implication is that if the leader is not open with the workers, they will not be open with the leader.)

Sarason is suggesting that the leader/principal (and the staff in general) must foster conditions where apprehensions, anxieties, and frustrations regarding goals and methods can be expressed. If this requirement is by-passed or minimized it will interfere with the commitment and ability of staff to extend the same opportunities to other involved in the task.

He is pointing out that there is a need to accept that problems are not only inevitable but are regular events and that anxiety, frustration, and disagreement over goals and methods are natural. From this, it seems, as a new program develops, it must have, as a regular feature, time for individual reflection and small and total group discussion. With the principal or leader acting as initial role model, sharing her/his concerns, anxieties, and frustrations as problems to be worked out and with staff doing the same with community members, it seems that much of the destructive tension in community school activities might be alleviated - energies would be devoted to resolving problems.

Let us now turn to a more specific consideration of the implications of a school moving into more extensive community "programs." The following implications have been drawn from the data gathered from both surveys and the case-studies of community schools presented in this report. Although these implications rely primarily on these data, we have incorporated among them many informal observations which we have made in the process of our research. Where these implications are not based directly on statistical data, they are invariably derived from comments written on the questionnaires or given to us during our visits to community schools. Our overall research has indicated that the following factors are critical considerations in the establishment and maintenance of community schools.

Leadership and Leadership Support

It seems that at least in the initial stages, a community school needs a strong leader. Almost invariably in our experience, this has been an interested principal dedicated to the concept of community involvement. The establishment of a community program requires the spending of considerable extra time and energy and it seems that only a person who is dedicated to the concept is able and willing to do this. The role tends to fall to the principal since he/she, more than any other single person, tends to be seen by the school and the community as the person in charge. Only rarely have community schools been established without the leadership of the principal. In these few cases, a community member was most likely to have taken the initiative. Occasionally a representative of the school board would be responsible.

At any rate, there seems to be a need for a strong leader, at the beginning. Whether or not this person need be the principal is yet to be established. Certainly, we have encountered no community schools which have operated without his/her active support, if not direct leadership. One of the implications of our study is that principals and Boards will have to clarify and prioritize their goals and time in order to manage these new roles. Many of the principals suffered from role overload and confusion; this statement includes the finding that they spend more time than they would like on some tasks (e.g. administrative) and less than they would like on others (e.g. facilitating curriculum implementation with staff, and community relations).

As the community school becomes more established, the day-to-day organization and co-ordination is generally taken over by other persons. The school's secretary, vice-principal, and some staff members may take on this role in smaller schools. Alternatively, a community council may be established. In larger schools, a person may be hired, at least on a part-time basis, to do this work. A person who teaches half-time and is responsible for community activities half-time is sometimes appointed. At other times there may be a full-time coordinator.

There is a necessity for some individuals to assume most of the routine work of the community school. Day-to-day paperwork, telephoning, duplicating, and other chores must be carried on without overburdening the person(s) who assume leadership.

There is a need for a certain amount of routinization including mechanisms and organizational means of identifying and addressing problems of implementation, in order to assure the continuation of the community school in the event of the leader's (principal's) move out of the community. Programs which are overly dependent on a particular person's involvement may collapse in the event of his/her leaving. The in-school coordinator, where a school can afford to hire such a person, is one solution to this problem. He/she will share, with the principal, the leadership function; in the case of one of them being transferred the other will provide some continuity. At any rate, there is a certain paradox in the leader's role, in that he/she must exercise a very strong leadership at first, but then should relax it and involve others in the role so as to assure the program's carry-over and growth.

There has been an increasing trend on the part of Boards of Education to appoint their own coordinators of community education. This trend is in part a result of grants that the Ministry of Education is making available to further community education. These individuals can offer much assistance to community schools at the beginning. They may help the principal and staff overcome some of the reservations which they may have; they may present to the school various ideas and suggestions for the organization of the community schools; and they can familiarize them with the resources available to them both from the Board and from other relevant sources. The co-ordinator can be a continual source of aid and resource to the community school at later stages as well by providing assistance and ideas. He/she can also become another source of continuity.

Board Guidelines

One concern that individuals have continually expressed is the need for a set of guidelines from the Board level regarding community school use and activities. This might eliminate some of the uncertainty over areas of jurisdiction that some community schools seem to experience. In the case of the suburban elementary school, for example, the members of the community school association were never completely certain as to the area of their responsibility or their role in making decision. When they had undertaken to allocate school space to various community groups, they discovered that this had already been done by the Board of Education. Much time and energy was expended in trying to establish the parameters of their function.

It was expressed by community school people from the rural elementary school that guidelines would be welcome but that they would not like to see a county policy implemented governing all community school use. This would be harmful to their program, which was dependent largely on flexibility and where many activities were carried on a no-charge basis.

Goals

In the enthusiasm which usually accompanies the initial formation of community-oriented programs at schools which have no previous experience in this direction, it sometimes happens that a great number of different types of activities are started. The organizers may come up with many ideas for directions in which to proceed, and people sign up to work on the different projects and committees which interest them. However, the number of persons who are able to devote the considerable time and energy needed for these tasks is usually quite limited and soon some of the original goals are dropped.

This "giving up" of goals, however functional, may have an unfortunate effect on overall morale. Our data (see especially "Suburban Elementary School" in the previous chapter) suggest that starting on a small scale and expanding as interests and abilities grow would be a preferable approach. The organizers should set a limited number of goals for the community school and attempt to undertake only a few types of activities in the beginning. In this way, the group is more likely to experience the satisfaction of goals which have been achieved, and of jobs which have been well done.

However, the limitation of directions may be a difficult task. It necessitates the expressing and the setting of priorities of the goals of individual participants in the organizing and coordinating of the community school. If there is a parent or community group which is taking this role, each member will bring to the group some personal reasons for which they joined and some personal goals they wish to achieve. Some of these may have to be given lower priorities than others. At any rate, the group should address itself, at a relatively early stage, to the defining and limiting of its goals and to the specifying of the practical aspects of the ways in which they will attempt to achieve these goals. The goals, and the degree of success in having met them, should be periodically reassessed. A brief and not overly formal statement of goals may be a helpful tool.

While community school members should try not to overextend themselves by undertaking too many different projects simultaneously, a certain amount of diversity may be necessary to maintain the interest of its members and of the community at large. Most schools in our survey reported that they had four or more different types of activities (e.g. a parent volunteer program, recreational activities for children, open library, etc.). It would seem that schools where there are some salaried community school workers (e.g. coordinators) may be able to achieve a greater degree of activeness and/or of diversity than schools which rely on volunteer help for planning and organizing programs. Of course, different formal bodies (e.g. Board of Education, day-time staff and administration, parents' group) may take charge of different aspects of community involvement. As in the case of our "Urban Secondary School," this may be highly successful, given that the jurisdictions of each area are clearly defined and that there is someone central who is able and willing to coordinate the overall system. In this way, a school, especially a larger one, can truly become a community centre in quite a broad sense.

Formalization

One issue that must be faced in initiating community school activities or in forming a community council or association is the degree in which the organization should become a formal one. From our data, particularly in two of the case studies, it would seem that it may often be inadvisable to be bound by extensive regulations and procedures in the early stages of formation. This is substantiated in our case study of the suburban elementary school. Most of the members of the community school association at this school agreed that their constitution had been a source of difficulty and prevented them from exercising a free hand in reaching their goals. At the rural school, community members had little patience for bureaucracy or for lengthy discussions of procedure and philosophy. They were concerned more with activity than with paper work and speculation as to goals and objectives.

It may well be that a highly formalized and structured community school will be viewed as somewhat ominous and intimidating by community members who might otherwise be interested in offering their services and becoming involved. There is, on the other hand, good reason for adopting a certain amount of formalization. For example, at the urban secondary school, it seemed that one possible weakness was the lack of written procedures to follow in order to carry out a given activity. Most activities were dependent upon a given leader. Should that individual leave without providing a task description, a rather large burden would fall upon his/her successor. The solution would probably involve the gradual establishment of a constitution in which procedures and activities evolve together, instead of one outpacing the other, as happens when there are a council and constitution which actually do very little, or a number of activities with little established procedure and organization.

Staff Support

One essential factor in the successful operation of a community school is the cooperation and support of the school's daytime staff. In the eyes of the Board of Education and of the school's administration, the needs of the daytime program always take precedence over other needs such as community use of facilities. The school's staff also may tend to think of the community as guests from the outside whose presence, although welcome, should not interfere in the "normal" activities of the school.

Although no teacher of the day program wants to have to deal with the added difficulties of disordered classrooms or broken equipment, the day staff can become more understanding of and receptive to the community if they have a good understanding of what the latter are doing in the school and if the community programs are designed so as to minimize interference with the daytime program. The direct involvement of staff in other aspects of community programs is probably the most effective way of increasing this understanding.

Channels of communication should be established. A coordinator, working in the school and known to the staff, seems to be an ideal link. In the absence of such a person, the role should be taken up by someone else such as the principal, secretary, or community representatives. The staff should know with whom they can discuss any areas of difficulty which may occur. In this way, problems may be settled quickly and with minimal damage to the overall relationship between school and community members.

A staff representative on community school councils appears to be a useful role as well. The representative is able to give the staff's point of view at times when decisions about future activities are being made.

Community volunteer programs are also likely to gain the staff's support. However, this might not be the case if the program is poorly organized (e.g. irregular attendance by volunteers).

On the school's staff, the role of custodian is of prime importance to the community school. The custodian will often have an increased workload because of the community activities. While it is important that there be funds available to pay the custodian for his work, it is even more essential that the person understand the nature of the community activities and be cooperative and supportive in this regard.

Communication

Responses from schools in our survey and information gained from schools in our case studies indicate that an essential requirement of a successful community school is a sensitivity to the needs and interests of the surrounding community. As well, there is a need to keep the community continuously informed and aware of activities at the school. The concern, then, is that a two-way communication network be established between school and community. From the school's point of view, some benefits are easily seen. Decisions of programming may be very ill-founded, unless based on a close and accurate assessment of community needs and interests, whether solicited or freely offered. What might not always be so apparent is that the decision to initiate community activities at all is just as dependent on community desires as is choice among possible programs. Merely because the school building is large, well equipped, and often empty is not enough reason in itself to initiate programs. Community interest is a prior requirement.

Another important consideration in this area is the speed with which community response can change. Needs and wishes vary according to seasonal, political and economic factors, available alternatives and many other uncontrollable variables. Although the school's commitment to and activity around community involvement is critical, other factors are often relevant. The following situation is very typical:

> Our efforts have been up and down. One year a ball of fire - the next, a smouldering ember. Your questionnaire has motivated me again.

The community school must be responsive to changes in community attitudes. As a supplement to the formal communication channels there needs to be a sensitivity that can be gained only from a first-hand knowledge of the people in the area and from personal exchanges with community members. As was pointed out in the case study of the rural elementary school, one assurance of this kind of familiarity is in having local people involved in the organization and operation of the community school.

At the rural school, the three key individuals in the community school were native to the area and had a deep understanding of the people. Not only does this awareness of the community insure a better assessment of needs, but community members are more apt to become involved, and in fact to volunteer their services, if they view the persons in positions of responsibility as approachable.

This last point raises a concern that seems to be prevalent among community school people. One difficulty shared by two of the schools in our case studies was in finding new people from the local community to accept leadership roles in the community school. In these two cases, there was a difficulty in recruiting new members to serve on the community school association. Neither school was able to wholly resolve this issue, but it would seem that one step in this direction would be to try and dispel community fears of the school and the school staff, and their view that the school is unapproachable and bureaucratic. They must see the school providing activities relevant to themselves and they must be made to feel comfortable in freely offering their suggestions and their skills.

Participants

In terms of the participants in community school activities, our data show certain tendencies regarding the relative ease of involving different types of people.

Children of elementary school age and their parents seem to be most easily drawn into school-related activities. Recreational activities for children are generally highly desired by their parents, who appear also to be ready to staff and coordinate such activities. As the children grow up and enter secondary school, interest falls off dramatically. Both parents are likely to be employed now and the students themselves appear not to desire their parents' presence in their schools.

Nevertheless, there are many community programs at this level as well as at the elementary one. However, these programs may be initially more difficult to establish, as it will be necessary to break down a certain amount of resistance as well as many preconceptions.

A number of persons responding to our survey commented about the difficulty of operating programs oriented specifically toward teenagers. It is often difficult to staff such programs and an occasional incidence of undesirable behaviour appears to receive great publicity. There was mention, however, of at least a few successful programs of this nature - some of them initiated and operated by the teenagers themselves.

Many community schools experience problems with attempting to involve the broader community - those families who do not have children at the school. If desired, the involvement of these individuals will have to be encouraged by considerable publicity - both through the media, and in a more personal way through other organizations in which they may be participants.

Funding

Although extra funding for the community-oriented program is often needed, our data show that a great many programs are largely self-supporting. It seems that many of the organizational and coordinating needs of community schools can be met by the use of talents which already exist in the school and the community. At least in the first few years of a community school's operation, there appears to be considerable volunteer help available from individuals who believe in and want to see this type of involvement.

Nevertheless, there are certain tasks for which extra funding is essential or, at least, very helpful. Foremost among these is custodial work. Increased use of the facility often results in increased need for caretaker services and, generally, these services are provided under a fee schedule set by the custodial union in conjunction with local Boards of Education.

A second and related area of importance is the need for extra supervisory personnel during evenings and weekends. In many cases, the principal or other daytime staff members are required to return to the school each night to supervise and then to lock up the building. The creation of a new part-time position - such as night secretary - would relieve some of the considerable strain on these individuals, provided the principal and staff desire such support.

Extra funding is generally needed, as well, for the increased use made of such things as office and washroom supplies. The school's budget for these materials is geared only to daytime use and cannot bear too great a strain from extra needs.

For the building and major equipment, extra maintenance and repair allowances will be necessary with increased use.

Community schools are often able and willing to raise their own funds through the use of fees or money-making events such as bake-sales or carnivals. There seems to be considerable value to these latter activities, since they themselves promote community spirit. It is probably desirable that the community continue to attempt to raise some funds for use of equipment and supplies needed for the community school program.

One additional need for outside funding appears to be that of communication costs. One difficulty experienced by many of the schools with which we were in contact is that of outreach. Community newsletters or the use of local television appear to be ideal tools for reaching a great many people. Funds spent on these, and generally on paper, postage, and advertising, would be very useful to any community school.

Community Control

One difficulty which people in our sample commented upon was a certain resistance to the label "community school." There seemed to be some confusion and concern about the definition of the term. Again and again, people would comment about their uncertainty about whether or not their school "qualified" as a community school. This would reflect some doubt on the part of the community school people as to which programs are really indicative of community involvement. One issue, however, seems to be a concern and uncertainty about where community involvement stops and community control begins. There seems to be a fear on the part of some school people that as the community becomes more interested and involved in the school, they will want to have a greater voice in the decision-making processes regarding the school as a whole.

Our findings do not support this expectation. Most community members appear to be quite content with a strictly advisory role. We find that community schools have been successful in facilitating community activity and that they are sensitive to many community needs. They are filling needs which were previously unmet. There does not seem to be, at this time at any rate, any great demand by the community to assume greater control:

> There are deeper aspects of the main concept, which we have never yet explored, but as far as we have gone, we have never found that the public ever took advantage of the freedom we gave them.

The Community and the School

One frequently mentioned barrier to establishing and developing a community school was lack of community interest or community apathy. It may be that if the community school activities respond to community members' needs and interests, such barriers might be minimized. On the other hand, communities are quite heterogeneous, both in comparison to one another and internally. Communities and community members will have different needs, interests, and energies, depending on their ethnic, social, and economic backgrounds. This presents a challenge to the leaders of the community school. One program, one timetable, and one location are unrealistic. Yet the impression that we get is that many principals feel that their school should develop such an all-encompassing program. It would seem that a community-based program must be developed, not one which is primarily school-based. By community-based we mean one which uses other community agencies as resources (not just those in the school.) There is a growing need to coordinate the existing services and resources (including personnel) within a community and to avoid replicating them in a community school.

Clearly, addressing these difficulties is not going to be simple. Yet we need not be pessimistic. The task is one of leadership and of coordination. It seems to us that given an acceptance of the community school concept, this task may begin within the existing school. On the whole, through our work we have found that principals in general are not only in favour of new forms of community participation, but have already set in motion mechanisms to address them. Our impression is, however, that the current additive approach may be a costly one. This approach may jeopardize the quality of various existing principal responsibilities and school programs as well as the new ones proposed. Principals' role responsibilities are seen as becoming impossibly complex, with the result that principals are concerned about being forced to abdicate their educational leadership role for an administrative role. One alternative approach may be to re-allocate some of what are now the principal's responsibilities to other individuals. A second alternative (and maybe this will be necessary in any event) is to examine and to re-define the principal's duties and priorities.

We have found that in terms of task priorities, principals have no wish to increase their administration responsibilities. In fact, they would prefer to have them reduced in favour of increased curriculum-related tasks, staff supervision, student- and support staff-related tasks, and community-related tasks (their preferences in this order on the basis of our data).

We see the foremost problem to be one of differing expectations, both in terms of (1) what the principal's role responsibilities are and how they are to be determined and (2) what the community school activities are and how they are to be done. As noted above, we see that the resolution of this difficulty is not a simple process. We see communication as being the integral component in the process - communication both within and across School Board, Ministry, and professional educator groups and local community agencies, representatives and the members of the community.

One mechanism to support such a process could be a series of focused (as opposed to general or all-encompassing) workshops involving these groups. Some workshops would be at a local level while others would have a broader perspective. By sharing information across workshop levels, Province-wide concerns and local concerns would be integrated. As well, both professional and "lay" perspectives could be taken into account. Through such workshop series, more clearly defined sets of role responsibilities and school activities could emerge, with the implications of these responsibilities and activities more fully understood. We are not advocating one specific set of role responsibilities or activities be created and standardized throughout the Province. The data have shown that this would be inappropriate and, indeed, untenable. What does seem to be needed is a process which can address the dynamic nature of the community school and which can take into account the concerns of the community members, the principal and the regular school, the Board, and the Ministry. Within this process there is the need for workshops which facilitate clarity in new goals and activities, and corresponding skill development for principals, community members, and teachers. It is important that each of these groups participate in defining these goals and needs, if the workshops are to be effective.

It is the authors' hope that these implications drawn from their research will be of some value to those people concerned with the continuation and growth of the community school movement. On the other hand, while it may be comforting to be presented with specific prescriptions which ensure the continued well-being of one's community school, we strongly feel that the focus of each community school must be internal. We would like to emphasize that each community school is somewhat different from every other one and must, above all, be responsive to the particular and unique nature of its neighbourhood. It is in this close symbiotic relationship that the full potential and promise of the community school may be realized.

350

Appendices

A Principals' Questionnaire

Spring, 1976

This is a survey of Ontario school principals. Its aim is to find out how principals see their role in relation to school and community. The study is under contract with the Ministry of Education and is being conducted by researchers from O.I.S.E. and from Queen's University.

We ask that you, as Principal, complete this form personally, rather than delegate the task to another person. The study requires that the principal's own perspective be given.

All information will be treated confidentially, and the final report will present data received from similar schools (e.g. elementary or secondary) in an aggregate form. As soon as the results of the survey become available, a summary will be mailed to all participants and contact persons who wish to have one. We expect to do this during the fall of 1976.

Most of the questions can be answered by circling the number which corresponds to your reply (e.g.②). Sometimes you will be asked to respond in your own words. Please feel free to add your comments to any item where you feel it relevant.

We realize that there are a great many other demands on your time, but we hope that you will find the questionnaire relevant and interesting to complete. It should take no more than one hour of your time, at most. Because of our own time constraints, we would appreciate your filling out the questionnaire within the next couple of weeks.

Please mail your completed questionnaire in the enclosed pre-paid envelope to Glenn Eastabrook, Community Schools Study, Queen's University.

Your time and effort in filling out the inventory are much appreciated. Thank you for your co-operation.

Glenn Eastabrook
Michael Fullan
Julia Clifford
Donna Lounsbury
Norman Nurmi

613 - 547-2785

SECTION A. Background Information

In this section we would like to ask some questions about your school, its surrounding community and your own professional background.

School Number ....

Number of full-time students ....

Number of full-time teachers ....

Number of vice-principals ....

Grade levels .... to ....

1. What is the population of the city/town/village in which your school is located?

    1. less than 10,000
    2. 10,000 - 39,999
    3. 40,000 - 99,999
    4. 100,000 - 499,999
    5. 500,000 or more

2. Describe the main type of community served by this school?

    1. suburban
    2. older residential area
    3. downtown/city core area
    4. small town
    5. rural

3. What is the occupational makeup of the families of the students at this school? Please indicate the relative proportion of each of the following types of occupations:

	Major Proportion (More Than 50%)	Minor Proportion (10% to 50%)	Insignificant Proportion (less than 10%)/ not represented
Professional/Managerial	1	2	3
Clerical/Skilled Labour	1	2	3
Rural/Farming	1	2	3
Unskilled Labour	1	2	3

4. What is the ethnic makeup of the families of the students at this school? Please indicate the relative proportion of all ethnic types:

	Major Proportion (More than 50%)	Minor Proportion (10% to 50%)	Insignificant Proportion (less than 10%)/ not represented
English	1	2	3
French	1	2	3
Native	1	2	3
Other (Please list all other groups of significant size)			
____________________	1	2	
____________________	1	2	
____________________	1	2	

5. What is your present age?

   1. less than 35
   2. 35 - 45
   3. 46 - 55
   4. 56 - 65
   5. 66 or more

6. What is your sex?

    1. Male
    2. Female

7. What is the highest academic qualification you now hold (excluding teachers' college)?

    1. Grade 12
    2. Grade 13
    3. Bachelor's Degree or equivalent
    4. More than a B.A. but less than an M.A.
    5. Master's Degree or equivalent
    6. Doctoral work begun
    7. Ph.D./D.Ed.

8. Please indicate the number of years you have been a teacher, a vice principal, a principal.

    I was a teacher for ____ years.

    I was a vice principal for ____ years.

    I have been a principal for ____ years.

9. How long have you been at your present school?

    1. One year or less
    2. 2 - 3 years
    3. 4 - 5 years
    4. 6 - 10 years
    5. 11 - 15 years
    6. 16 - 20 years
    7. More than 20 years.

SECTION B. The Role of the Principal in the School as a Whole

In this section we would like to examine your perceptions of your overall role as principal.

10.(a) The school principal performs a wide variety of tasks. We would like to find out how, at the present time, you apportion your time among the following types of school activities. Please circle one number for each of the items listed below.

I do spend.....	A great deal of my time	Quite a bit of my time	A moderate amount of my time	Relatively little of my time
- administrative tasks (e.g. timetabling, budgeting, 'paperwork')	1	2	3	4
- curriculum-related tasks (e.g. planning, evaluation)	1	2	3	4
- staff-related tasks (e.g. supervision, evaluation)				
(i) support staff	1	2	3	4
(ii) teaching staff	1	2	3	4
- teaching in the classroom	1	2	3	4
- student-related activities (other than teaching)	1	2	3	4
- professional activities outside of the school (e.g. board meetings, conferences)	1	2	3	4
- community-school relations (e.g. talking with members of community, organizing volunteers)	1	2	3	4

10.(b) It may be that the way you would prefer to spend your time is somewhat different from what you indicated above. Ideally, how would your time as principal be apportioned?

I would like to spend..	A great deal of my time	Quite a bit of my time	A moderate amount of my time	Relatively little of my time
- administrative tasks (e.g. timetabling, budgeting, 'paperwork')	1	2	3	4
- curriculum-related tasks (e.g. planning, evaluation)	1	2	3	4
- staff-related tasks (e.g. supervision, evaluation)				
(i) support staff	1	2	3	4
(ii) teaching staff	1	2	3	4
- teaching in the classroom	1	2	3	4
- student-related activities (other than teaching)	1	2	3	4
- professional activities outside of the school (e.g. board meetings, conferences)	1	2	3	4
- community-school relations (e.g. talking with members of community, organizing volunteers)	1	2	3	4

(c) Is there any person or group of persons who could effectively assume those aspects of your present role at which you would prefer to spend less time? Please indicate briefly how other individuals or groups could free some of your time for more preferred activities.

11. Individuals and groups in the school may be involved to varying degrees in the decision-making processes of that particular school.

(a) To what extent do the following groups or individuals usually share in decisions about the curriculum of this school?

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- other staff members	1	2	3	4
- parents/community	1	2	3	4
- students	1	2	3	4

(b) To what extent should they share in decisions about the curriculum?

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- other staff members	1	2	3	4
- parents/community	1	2	3	4
- students	1	2	3	4

12. (a) To what extent do you feel the following groups or individuals usually share in decisions about rules and practices of this school?

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- other staff members	1	2	3	4
- parents/community	1	2	3	4
- students	1	2	3	4

(b) To what extent should they share in decisions about rules and practices?

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- other staff members	1	2	3	4
- parents/community	1	2	3	4
- students	1	2	3	4

13. (a) To what extent do you feel the following groups or individuals usually share in decisions about the philosophy of this school? (e.g. goals and objectives)

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- other staff members	1	2	3	4
- parents/community	1	2	3	4
- students	1	2	3	4

(b) To what extent should they share in decisions about the school philosophy?

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- other staff members	1	2	3	4
- parents/community	1	2	3	4
- students	1	2	3	4

14. In carrying out your role as principal, to what extent do you feel that you are constrained by the following factors or groups?

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- time limitations	1	2	3	4
- limited operating/ personnel budget	1	2	3	4
- conflicting views with staff				
(i) support staff	1	2	3	4
(ii) teaching/administrative staff	1	2	3	4
- Board of Education				
(i) administration	1	2	3	4
(ii) trustees	1	2	3	4
- formal administrative procedures	1	2	3	4
- community/parents	1	2	3	4
- school space or equipment	1	2	3	4

14. (cont.)

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- students	1	2	3	4
- teacher federations	1	2	3	4
- support staff unions	1	2	3	4
- Ministry of Education	1	2	3	4
- other (please specify)	1	2	3	4

15. In carrying out your role as principal, to what extent have the following groups or factors helped you to accomplish your goals as principal?

	A great deal	Somewhat	Very little	Not at All
- Board of Education				
(i) administration	1	2	3	4
(ii) trustees	1	2	3	4
- school staff				
(i) support staff	1	2	3	4
(ii) teaching/administrative staff	1	2	3	4
- school space or equipment	1	2	3	4
- school budget	1	2	3	4
- community/parents	1	2	3	4
- students	1	2	3	4
- other (please specify)	1	2	3	4

16. In what ways, if any, do you feel the fact that you are female/male affects your professional relationship with each of the following groups:

	It is not a factor in this relationship	It helps	It hinders
- School staff			
(i) support staff	1	2	3
(ii) professional staff	1	2	3
- students	1	2	3
- parents/community	1	2	3
- senior administration of the Board of Education	1	2	3
- fellow principals	1	2	3

Please use the space below to comment on any aspect of the above relationships or to describe any other ways in which your sex has affected your role as principal:

17. From your experience, what is the greatest problem facing the principalship as it is evolving today?

Please use the space below to express any additional views you may have about the role of the principal in the school as a whole:

SECTION C. Parent-School Communication

In this section, we would like to examine your perceptions of the amount and quality of communication which exists between parents and your school.

18 .(a) During a typical school week, how often do you personally talk with parents on the telephone or in person?

1. several times a day
2. at least once a day
3. every few days
4. at least once a week
5. never

(b) What is the main subject of discussion during these exchanges?

1. students' academic performance
2. disciplinary matters
3. other school related matters (please specify)
4. other (please specify)

19. In general, do you encourage your staff to communicate directly with parents regarding student performance or disciplinary matters (other than during the usual parent-teacher interviews)?

1. Yes, I prefer them to deal directly with parents.
2. No, I prefer that these matters be handled through the school's office.
3. I prefer that each teacher decide how the matter should be handled.

20. How many times a year does the school sponsor student performances for the general public (e.g. concerts, plays, variety shows, etc.)?

1. once a year
2. twice a year
3. three times a year
4. four or more times a year

21. Other than parent-teacher interviews, how often does this school provide an opportunity, on an organized basis, for parents to see how the school operates? (e.g. Open House, classroom visitations)

    1. more than twice a year
    2. semi-annually
    3. annually
    4. never

22. What is your preference regarding parent visits to the school during the school day?

    1. Parents should feel free to drop in at any time.
    2. They are welcome to come after first contacting the office.
    3. I prefer that they restrict their visits to those occasions organized for this purpose (e.g. parent-teacher interviews).

23. Other than report cards, how many letters of communication (e.g. newsletters) about activities at the school has this school sent to parents during the current school year (i.e. since September, 1975)?

    1. five or more
    2. three or four
    3. one or two
    4. We don't send out newsletters.

    If you make use of these forms of communication, please describe their general format and/or orientation:

24. Does this school, of its own initiative, make use of community media other than newsletters (e.g. radio, newspaper, T.V.)?

1. often
2. sometimes
3. seldom
4. never

25. In general, how satisfied are you with the amount and quality of communication you have with parents of students at your school?

1. very satisfied
2. somewhat satisfied
3. somewhat dissatisfied
4. very dissatisfied
5. no opinion

26. Would you like parents to take more initiative in approaching you and your staff about school-related matters?

1. Yes, there is a need for this.
2. No, they take the right amount of initiative now.
3. No, they take too much initiative already.

Please use the space below to express any additional views you may have about parent-school communication:

SECTION D. Community Related Curriculum

One way in which community and school life can be integrated is through the school curriculum. In this section, we would like to examine the different ways in which this might be happening in this school.

27. How many parents and/or members of the community work as volunteers on a regular basis in the school (e.g. helping in the library or in a remedial reading program)?

    1. none
    2. 1 - 3 volunteers
    3. 4 - 6 volunteers
    4. 7 - 10 volunteers
    5. more than 10.

28. How often does this school rely on occasional volunteer work by parents/community members (e.g. field trips, driving, etc.)?

    1. at least once a week
    2. at least once a month
    3. at least once a year
    4. never

29. What is your role regarding the overall volunteer program in the school?

    1. As indicated above, there is no such program in our school.
    2. I was actively involved in the establishment of the program.
    3. I strongly support this program, although I wasn't involved in its establishment.
    4. I officially approve this program but have no active involvement in its day-to-day operation.
    5. Although such a program exists in our school, I have some reservations about it. (Please specify)

30. In general, is it a school practice to have aspects of the school curriculum reflect issues (e.g. cultural, socio-economic) of the surrounding community?

    1. Yes, we attempt to do this in those courses where it is relevant.
    2. Although there's no school-wide policy, some teachers are doing this in their own classes.
    3. This is not a consideration in designing the curriculum at our school.

31.(a) Do you have community members from outside of the teaching profession come in to this school to talk to students about their particular areas of expertise (e.g. visiting speakers, poets, artists, practical demonstrations, etc.)?

    1. frequently
    2. sometimes
    3. once in a while
    4. never

(b) In general, do these tend to be single visits, or do the visitors tend to come in on a more regular basis (i.e. throughout the year)?

    1. no such program
    2. regular basis mainly
    3. single visit basis mainly
    4. both types equally

32. What is your role regarding the type of program described above (Question # 30)?

    1. There is no such program in our school
    2. I was actively involved in the establishment of the program.
    3. I strongly support this program, although I wasn't involved in its establishment.

4. I officially approve this program but have no active involvement in its day-to-day operation.

5. Although such a program exists in this school, I have some reservations about it. (Please specify)

33. How often do students of this school go on field trips to the local community (e.g. visiting local industries, outdoor science education, etc.)?

1. frequently
2. sometimes
3. once in a while
4. never

34. Are any of the students at this school involved on a regular basis with the community as part of their course work (e.g. work-study program in business or industry, using community resources)?

1. Yes
2. No

35. What is your role regarding those aspects of the school program which involve students going out into the community (i.e. Questions 33 & 34)?

1. There is no such program in our school.
2. I was actively involved in the establishment of the program.
3. I strongly support this program, although I wasn't involved in its establishment.
4. I officially approve this program, but have no active involvement in its day-to-day operation.
5. Although such a program exists in our school, I have some reservations about it. (Please specify)

Please use the space below to express any additional views you may have about community related curriculum:

SECTION E. School-Community Committees

In this section, we would like to explore the nature of any formal channels of communication which may exist between your school and the surrounding community.

36. Is there a school - community committee of some type operating specifically at the level of this school?

    1. Yes

    2. No

    If no, please skip to question # 40.

37. Please describe briefly the activities and format of this committee. (If more than one committee exists, please describe the one which you feel is operating most effectively.)

38. If there is such a group, how effective do you feel it has been as a mechanism of communication between school and community?

1. very effective
2. somewhat effective
3. slightly effective
4. not at all effective

Comments:

39. If there is such a group, what is the nature of your involvement with it?

1. I am actively involved in organizing/co-ordinating activities of the group.
2. While I'm not actively involved as an organizer, I attend most meetings.

39. (cont.)

3. Although I don't always attend meetings, I like to keep informed of the group's activities.
4. I'm involved only on an occasional basis (e.g. when asked to attend).
5. I have no involvement with this group.

40. Is this school represented on a committee operating at a more general level (e.g. Board or "area" committee) where members of the school system and of the community meet to discuss school-related issues?

1. Yes
2. No

If no, please skip to end of Section E.

If yes, please describe briefly:

41. If there is such a group, what is the nature of your involvement with it?

1. I am actively involved in organizing/co-ordinating activities of the group.
2. While I'm not actively involved as an organizer, I attend most meetings.
3. Although I don't always attend meetings, I like to keep informed of the group's activities.
4. I'm involved only on an occasional basis (e.g. when asked to attend).
5. I have no involvement with this group.

Please use the space below to express any additional views you may have about school-community committees.

SECTION F. Use of School Facilities

In this section, we are interested in finding out what extra services may be offered through this school's facilities.

42.(a) At this school, are there any recreational and/or educational activities for children and/or teenagers after-hours or on weekends?

1. Yes
2. No

If no, please continue with question # 43.

(b) What types of programs are offered? Please indicate all types.

1. Athletics (sports and exercise)
2. Interest clubs and courses
3. Youth groups (Guides, Drop-ins etc.)
4. Special events (e.g. films, dances, carnivals)
5. Summer programs
6. Ethnic language and cultural programs
7. Other (please describe)

(c) Who is mainly responsible for the on-going operation of these programs?

1. The school's day-time staff
2. Other person(s) employed by the Board of Education (please specify)

3. Some other organization or group (please specify)

43.(a) Are there regularly scheduled recreational and/or educational programs for adults at this school?

1. Yes
2. No

If no, please continue with question # 44.

(b) What types of programs are offered? Please indicate all types.

1. Athletics (sports & exercise)
2. Interest clubs and courses
3. Community and special interest groups
4. Academic upgrading and basic education
5. Special events
6. Ethnic language and cultural programs
7. Other (please describe)

(c) Who is mainly responsible for organizing and staffing these programs?

1. The school's day-time staff
2. Other person(s) employed by the Board of Education (please specify)

3. Some other organization or group (please specify)

(d) Are any of these programs for adults held during the regular school day?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, please specify:

44. What is the nature of your involvement in these programs for children and/or adults? If there are no such programs, please continue with question # 45.

(a) I am actively involved in organizing/co-ordinating some or all of these activities.

1. Yes

2. No

(b) I am an instructor and/or supervisor for some of these activities.

1. Yes

2. No

(c) I act as a resource person to those who organize and supervise these activities.

1. Yes

2. No

(d) I act in some other capacity.

1. Yes

2. No

If yes, please describe:

45. Is the library or resource centre of this school open, on a regular basis, to the community?

1. Yes

2. No

46. Are any special services (e.g. medical/dental, legal, daycare, etc.) provided at this school to the general public?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, please describe briefly, indicating the sponsoring agency and the nature of your own involvement with the service:

47. Has this school been involved in any neighbourhood improvement projects within the past two years?

1. Yes
2. No

If yes, please describe briefly:

48. Does community use of this school's facilities make extra demands on you as a principal?

1. Yes
2. No
3. There is no community use of our facilities.

If yes, please describe the nature and extent of these demands:

49. In general, what are your feelings about community use of this school's facilities?

1. I am very much in favour of this.
2. I am somewhat in favour of this.
3. I am somewhat opposed to this.
4. I am very opposed to this.

Please use the space below to indicate any other feelings you may have about community use of school facilities.

SECTION G. General Question Regarding Community Involvement

In this last section, we would like to ask a few general questions about the topic of community involvement in school.

50. What person at this school has the greatest responsibility for organizing and/or supervising any community-related activities?

    1. There are no community-related activities.
    2. There is no single person responsible.
    3. Myself, as principal
    4. Vice-principal or Administrative Assistant
    5. Secretary
    6. Teacher
    7. Community-school co-ordinator
    8. Parent or community member
    9. Other (please specify)

51. In your opinion, do members of the community seem interested in what goes on at this school?

    1. To a great extent
    2. A moderate amount
    3. A little
    4. Not at all
    5. Don't know.

52. In the past two years, have you attended any conferences where school-community relations was a focus of attention or an area of discussion?

1. Yes

2. No

If yes, please comment on the degree to which you found this (these) conference(s) worthwhile.

53. There seems to be a concern on the part of some educators that involvement of the community in the school may lead to a demand by the community to assume greater control. What are your feelings about this?

54. To what extent do you think that each of the following groups is in favour of increased community involvement at this school?

	Very much in favour	Somewhat in favour	A little in favour	Not at all in favour	Don't know
Ministry of Education	1	2	3	4	5
Board of Education					
(i) Trustees	1	2	3	4	5
(ii) Administrators	1	2	3	4	5
Staff of this school	1	2	3	4	5
Students of this school	1	2	3	4	5
Parents/other community members	1	2	3	4	5
Your Teachers' Federation affiliate	1	2	3	4	5
You, as principal	1	2	3	4	5

55. What do you see as the major support needs regarding the development of community involvement at this school?

56. What do you see as the major barriers regarding the development of community involvement at this school?

57. What skills or resources do you feel you personally need to acquire in order to deal more successfully with community involvement?

58. Who do you think should be mainly responsible for helping you develop in this direction?

1. Ministry of Education
2. Teachers' Federation
3. Board of Education
4. Other (please specify)

Please use the space below to add any further comments which you may have regarding the topics covered in this questionnaire and to indicate your reactions to this survey:

Note: If you would like to receive a summary of findings from this research project, please check here: ☐

THANK YOU, AGAIN, FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION

B Duties of the Principal

14.—(1) In addition to his duties under *The Schools Administration Act*, a principal shall perform the duties prescribed in subsections 2 to 8. O. Reg. 339/66, s. 16 (1).

(2) A principal shall,

(*a*) make recommendations to the board respecting additions or alterations to the school building;

(*b*) inspect the school premises regularly and report promptly to the secretary of the board,

(i) any repairs required, and

(ii) any lack of attention on the part of the caretaker;

(*c*) instruct pupils in the care of the school premises;

(*d*) subject to the approval of the board, appoint one or more of the teachers for supervisory duty at any time during the period beginning one-half hour before classes begin for the day and ending fifteen minutes after classes end for the day when the school building and the playgrounds are open to the pupils and classes are not in session, and arrange for the supervision of any other school activity authorized by the board;

(*e*) exercise control over the amount of homework assigned to pupils;

(*f*) assign suitable quarters for the lunch period;

(*g*) report to the board, on request, on the efficiency of the teaching staff;

(*h*) report promptly to the parent any serious neglect of duty or infraction of the school rules by a pupil;

(*i*) issue a statement of progress to a pupil withdrawing from the school; and

(*j*) refuse admission to a pupil not eligible for admission. O. Reg. 339/66, s. 16 (2); O. Reg. 374/67, s. 5 (1).

(3) A principal is responsible for,

(*a*) the maintenance of a school record for each pupil;

(*b*) the guiding and counselling of pupils with respect to their duties, the courses of study and, where applicable, the vocations to which the courses of study lead and the requirements for admission thereto;

(*c*) the maintenance of close co-operation with the homes and, where applicable, the industry and business of the community; and

(*d*) the progress of pupils, except where the Secondary School Graduation Diploma issued by the Minister grants admission to Grade 13. O. Reg. 339/66, s 16 (3); O. Reg. 374/67, s. 5 (2).

(4) Subject to section 40, a principal is in charge of the management and discipline of his school and, subject to revision by the inspector, is in charge of the organization of his school.

(5) Where an elementary school and a secondary school jointly occupy or use in common a school building or school grounds, the principal of the secondary school has charge of those parts of the building or grounds that the schools occupy or use in common. O. Reg. 339/66, s. 16 (4, 5).

(6) Where, after reasonable notice by the principal, a parent or guardian fails to provide his child or ward with supplies required for a course of study or to pay the fees imposed for the purpose by the board, the principal shall promptly notify the board. O. Reg. 339/66, s. 16 (6); O. Reg. 374/67, s. 5 (3).

(7) Where a board has appointed a superintendent of schools but not a director, the principal shall transmit his reports and recommendations to the board through the superintendent.

(8) Where a board has appointed a director of education, the principal shall transmit his reports and recommendations to the board through the superintendent and the director.

(9) In addition to the duties prescribed in subsections 2 to 8, a secondary school principal shall,

- (*a*) supervise the instruction in the school and, assisted by the heads of departments, advise and assist the teachers;
- (*b*) make allowance in the timetable for special duties required of heads of departments and other teachers;
- (*c*) develop co-operation among the members of the staff and co-ordination of effort by,
  - (i) delegating duties to vice-principals, heads of departments, the technical director, and the commerical director, and
  - (ii) calling meetings of the teachers to discuss matters relating to the management and organization of the school;
- (*d*) recommend to the board,
  - (i) the promotion and appointment of teachers, and
  - (ii) the demotion or dismissal of a teacher whose work or attitude is unsatisfactory, but only after warning the teacher in writing, giving him assistance and allowing him a reasonable time to improve; and
- (*e*) submit to the board an annual budget for supplies and equipment. O. Reg. 339/66, s. 16 (7-9).

Bibliography

Allan, David, "Schools: A Case for Community Education." Working Paper No. 3: Vancouver, British Columbia Trustees Association, 1973.

Blake, R. R., and Mouton, J. S., The Managerial Grid. Houston, Texas: Gulf, 1964.

Boles, H. W., The 3 R's and the New Religion, Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1973.

Boles, H. W., and Davenport, J. A., Introduction to Educational Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Canadian Educators Association, "The Changing Role of Educational Leadership," CEA & the University of Alberta, Faculty of Education, Edmonton, 1971.

Chapman, S., "Community Use of Schools". Ontario Education, Vol. 4, No. 3, 1972.

Clifford et al, Community School Survey, Under Ontario Ministry of Education Research Contract # 7, phase 1, 1974.

Cressy, G., "Participation and Involvement: A Question of Access." Key Address at Education and Public Policy Conference, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, April 15-16, 1977.

Decker, L., Foundations of Community Education, Midland Michigan: Pendell, 197

Ellis, A., Executive Leadership: A Rational Approach, Secaucus, N.J.: Citadel Press, 1972.

Eastabrook et al, Community Schools Survey in Ontario, Ministry of Education Contract Published, Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1977.

Fantini, Mario d. (ed.), Alternative Education: A Source Book for Parents, Teachers, Students and Administrators. New York: Anchor Books, 1976.

Fein, L. J., The Ecology of the Public Schools: An Inquiry Into Community Control. New York: Pegasus, 1971.

Filson, Glen, "A Report to Define Community Education in Scarborough." A report to the Scarborough Board of Education through a Ministry of Education Grant, 1975.

Foskett, J. M., The Normative World of the Elementary School Principal. The Centre for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1967.

Fullan, M. and Pomfret, A., "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 335-397, 1977.

Gayfer, Margaret, Open Doors: A Community School Handbook, Toronto, Ministry of Education, 1977.

Goldhammer and Becker, "What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal?" American Education, Vol. 6, No. 3, p. 11 (April 1970).

Goldsborough, H. et al, Education in Transition: A Capsule Review 1960-1975, Toronto, Canadian Education Association, 1975.

Gross, N. et al, Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Gross, N. and Trask, A., The Sex Factor and the Management of Schools. Toronto: Wiley, 1976.

Halpin, A. W., Theory and Research in Administration. New York: MacMillan, 1966.

Hickey, H. W., et al, The Role of the School in Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1969.

Horowitz, M. et al, "Divergent Views of the Principal's Role: Expectations Held by Principals, Teachers and Superintendents." The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XV, 1969.

Kindred, L. J., et al, The School and Community Relations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976.

Jacobson, P. B. et al, The Principalship: New Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Levin, Henry M., (ed.), Community Control of Schools. Don Mills, Ontario: Musson, 1970.

Lind, L., The Learning Machine: A Hard Look at Toronto's Schools. Toronto: Anansi, 1974.

Martell, George (ed.), The Politics of the Canadian Public School. Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, Publishers, 1974.

McGregor, D., The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw, 1974.

Melton, A., (ed.), Coding Processes in Human Memory, Washington: V.H. Winston, 1971.

Minzey, J. D. and LeTarte, C., Community Education: From Program to Process. Midland, Mi.: Pendell, 1972.

National Education Association of the United States, Dept. of Elementary School Principals, The Elementary School Principalship in 1968. A research study, Washington, 1968.

Nie, N. et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Primer, New York, McGraw Hill, 1970, 1975.

Ontario Ministry of Education, The Formative Years Curricula P_1J_1 1975. Secondary School Organization and Diploma Requirements, Curricular H.S. 1973/4 - 1976/7. The Secondary/Post-Secondary Interface Study[1] 1977.

Pomfret, A., "Involving Parents in Schools: Toward Developing a Social Intervention Technology," *Interchange*, Vol. 3, No. 213, 1972.

Rose, A., *Governing Metropolitan Toronto: A Social & Political Analysis*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1972.

Sarason, S. B., *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.

Scott, Glenn, The Urban Elementary Public School Principal in Ontario. His Status Accoding to the Expressed Views of Principals and Senior Administration Officials, Ed.D. Thesis, U. of T., 1965.

Shuttleworth, Dale, "The Flemingdon Road Community School - An Experiment in Community School Development", in J. Draper (ed.) *Citizen Participation in Canada*, Toronto: New Press, 1971.

Seay, M. F., et al, *Community Education: A Developing Concept*. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1974.

Smilanich, R., "The Community School: The Process is the Product," *Alberta Counsellor*, 3(Spring) 1973, pp. 113-46.

Smith, L. & Keith, P., *Anatomy of Educational Innovation: An* Organization *Organizational Aanalysis of an Elementary School*, Toronto: Wiley, 1971.

Stevens, J., "Community Schools," *Education Canada*, Vol. XIV, No. 4, (Dec. 1974).

Totten, F., *Power of Community Education*: Midland, Michigan: Pendell, 1972.

Watts, J., (ed.), "Participatory Government - the Place of the Head" in *The Countesthorpe Experience*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1976.

Whitt, R. & Burden, L., *The Community School Principal*. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing, 1973.

Wilson, A. and Smith, V., "The Public School Principal's Function in School-Community Relations as Defined by Context Analysis of Periodicals and Books," Kansas State University, 1974.